

measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1443. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of various citizens of Woodsfield, Ohio, recommending the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1444. Also, petition of various citizens of Guernsey County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1445. Also, petition of various citizens of Marietta, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, a bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1446. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of J. C. Montgomery and 104 other citizens of Franklin County, Tex., urging the enactment of House bill 1649, introduced by the Honorable PAT CANNON of Florida; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1447. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition submitted by May DeGreene, of Addison, Mich., and signed by 23 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1448. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. W. C. Almy and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1449. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 68 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1450. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Anna M. Reist and 14 other members of the Wilbur Samuels Camp and Auxiliary, United Spanish War Veterans of Manhattan, Kans., urging support of House bill 2350, and stating the need of many for the increase of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

1451. Also, petition of Mrs. C. M. Clements, representing the Hiawatha Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 128 other citizens, urging support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, stating that our country needs our best service at this time and liquor is saboteur No. 1 at the present time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1452. Also, petition of U. R. Welsh and 52 other citizens of Robinson, Kans., and that community, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1453. Also, petition of Rev. Troy P. Bess, of Holton, Kans., and 43 other citizens of that community, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1454. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chandlersville, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, a bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1455. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of W. E. Reid, Italy, Tex., favoring House

bill 2684; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1456. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Mrs. F. A. Chamberlain, president, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 157 citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1457. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Memorial of the Illinois House of Representatives, May 19, 1943, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps in order to assure that the close of World War No. 2 will not find our Nation unprepared to properly care for our sick and wounded, as was the case in World War No. 1; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1458. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 796; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in the former times didst lead our fathers forth into this land, give Thy grace to us their children in these days of crisis, that we may prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and eager to be the instruments of Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Save the inner life of the Nation from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. By the very fiery trial through which we are passing fashion into one people the multitudes brought hither of many kindreds and tongues. As we gird ourselves to do battle with the principalities and powers of evil Thou art the courage that arms us, the strength that sustains us.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom those who have been trusted with responsibility and authority in these troublous times. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the opportunity still to be free souls, for the redemption of democracy from its failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace, we lift our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

### NOTICE OF ILLUSTRATED LECTURE ON THE HELICOPTER BY IGOR SIKORSKY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I announce to Members of Congress that the Senate Naval Affairs Committee cordially invites all Members of Congress and their staffs to attend a motion picture and illustrated lecture setting forth the value of the helicopter by Igor Sikorsky, noted airplane designer and inventor, to be given in the caucus room, 318 Senate Office Building, Wednesday, June 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m. This program should be of great interest to all Members.

### ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE DELEGATES TO UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered yesterday afternoon, June 7, 1943, by the President of the United States to the delegates to the United Nations Conference on food and agriculture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It gives me great pleasure to welcome to the White House you who have served so splendidly at the epoch-making United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

I use that word "epoch-making" advisedly. The Conference could not have failed to be significant because it was the first United Nations Conference. But it has succeeded even beyond our hopes; it is truly epoch-making because, in reaching unanimity upon complex and difficult problems, you have demonstrated beyond question that the United Nations really are united—not only for the prosecution of the war but for the solution of the many and difficult problems of peace. This conference has been a living demonstration of the methods by which the conversations of nations of like mind contemplated by Article VII of the Mutual Aid Agreement can and will give practical application to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

You have been dealing with agriculture, the most basic of all human activities, and with food, the most basic of all human needs. Twice as many people are employed in work on food and agriculture as in work in all other fields combined. And all people have, in the literal sense of the word, a vital interest in food.

That a child or adult should get the nourishment necessary for full health is too important a thing to be left to mere chance.

You have recognized that society must accept this responsibility. As you stated in your declaration, "The primary responsibility lies with each nation for seeing that its own people have the food needed for health and life; steps to this end are for national deter-

mination. But each nation can fully achieve its goal only if all work together." On behalf of the United States I accept this declaration.

You have gone beyond the general recognition of principles to deal in specific terms with specific tasks and projects.

You have examined the needs of all countries for food and other agricultural products, both as they will exist in the short-run period of recovery from the devastation of war and as they will exist over the longer run, when our efforts can be fully devoted to expanding the production of food so that it will be adequate for health the world over.

You have surveyed with courage and with realism the magnitude of these problems and have reached unanimous agreement that they can, and must—and will—be solved.

It is true that no nation has ever had enough food to feed all of its people as we now know human beings should be fed. But neither have nations representing over 80 percent of the world's 2,000,000,000 inhabitants ever before been joined together to achieve such an aim. Never before have they set out to bend their united efforts to the development of the world's resources so that all men might seek to attain food they need.

For the short run, you have pointed out steps which have to be taken both in increasing supplies and in maintaining economy of use and coordination of distribution.

In considering our long-range problems, you have surveyed our knowledge of the inadequacy in the quantity and quality of the diet of peoples in all lands. You have pooled our knowledge of the means of expanding our output, of increasing our agricultural efficiency, and of adjusting agricultural production to consumption needs. In the fields of both production and consumption you have recognized the need for the better utilization of the knowledge we now have and for extending still further the boundaries of our knowledge through education and research.

You have called upon your governments individually and collectively to enlarge and improve their activities in these fields.

For the perfection and rapid execution of these plans, you have recommended the creation of a permanent United Nations organization. To facilitate and hasten the creation of that organization, and to carry on the work you have begun until its creation, you have established an interim commission. The Government of the United States is honored that you have asked that the interim commission have its seat in Washington, and will be glad to take the preliminary action for the establishment of that commission which you have entrusted to it.

Finally, you have expressed your deep conviction that our goal in this field cannot be attained without forward action in other fields as well. Increased food production must be accompanied by increased industrial production and by increased purchasing power. There must be measures for dealing with trade barriers, international exchange stability, and international investment. The better use of natural and human resources must be assured to improve the living standard; and, may I add, the better use of these resources without exploitation on the part of any nation. Many of these questions lie outside the scope of the work you have undertaken, but their solution is nonetheless essential to its success. They require, and shall receive, our united attention.

In the political field, these relationships are equally important. And they work both ways. A sound world agricultural program will depend upon world political security, while that security will in turn be greatly strengthened if each country can be assured

of the food it needs. Freedom from want and freedom from fear go hand in hand.

Our ultimate objective can be simply stated: It is to build for ourselves, for all men, a world in which each individual human being shall have the opportunity to live out his life in peace; to work productively, earning at least enough for his actual needs and those of his family; to associate with the friends of his choice; to think and worship freely; and to die secure in the knowledge that his children, and their children, shall have the same opportunities.

That objective, as men know from long and bitter experience, will not be easy to achieve. But you and I know also that, throughout history, there has been no more worth-while, no more inspiring challenge.

That challenge will be met.

You have demonstrated beyond question that free peoples all over the world can agree upon a common course of action and upon common machinery for action. You have brought new hope to the world that, through the establishment of orderly international procedures for the solution of international problems there will be attained freedom from want and freedom from fear. The United Nations are united in the war against fear and want as solidly and effectively as they are united on the battle front in this world-wide war against aggression.

And we are winning by action and unity.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Eyrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### AMENDMENT OF LAW FIXING THE HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act entitled "An Act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes" approved August 14, 1935, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### PAYMENT TO NONCITIZENS EMPLOYED IN GOOD FAITH, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Private Law 537, 77th Congress, approved May 2, 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

#### RAIL FREIGHT SERVICE COSTS IN THE VARIOUS RATE TERRITORIES (S. Doc. No. 63)

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution No. 119 (submitted by Mr. STEWART and agreed to March 26, 1943) certain information on rail freight service costs in the various rate territories of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

#### REPORT BY THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, report No. 4 of action taken under section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1943, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:



By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to provide a permanent means of aiding civilian defense workers who are war casualties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Piper and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE—RESOLUTION OF ALABAMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference and printing at this point in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of Alabama endorsing Senate Resolution No. 114.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Alabama will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and also printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of Alabama is as follows:

##### Senate Joint Resolution 14

Joint resolution endorsing United States Senate Resolution 114, which provides for the forming of an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority, and urging passage of said resolution by the United States Senate

Whereas the people of Alabama are desirous that the war be brought to a successful termination as rapidly as possible and that guarantees of enduring peace and security be provided; and

Whereas the formation of an organization of the United Nations as provided in United States Senate Resolution 114 is a proper step toward attaining these ends, in that said organization—

(1) Will assist in the coordination and complete utilization of the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis;

(2) Will better enable the establishment of satisfactory temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces until such time as permanent governments can be established;

(3) Will further the administration of relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces;

(4) Will enable the development of procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of dissensions and disagreements between nations; and

(5) Will provide for the assemblance and maintenance of a military force and the suppression by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama does hereby approve United States Senate Resolution 114, and does urge its speedy adoption by the Senate of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Senators from Alabama, and to each of the four Senators who joined in presenting this resolution.

LXXXIX—344

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1203. A bill to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 291).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 674. A bill authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men; with an amendment (Rept. No. 292).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Samuel Margolin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1170. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SALES OF WHEAT FOR FEED

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to have a measure taken up in order to expedite an issue raised last Friday, when the Senate unanimously amended the lend-lease bill by adopting a provision enabling 50,000,000 bushels of wheat to be released for sale. I find, on my return today, that last Friday the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 133, identical with the Senate amendment to the lend-lease bill, and it is now on the desk of the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 133 be considered and passed at this time, in view of the fact that the Senate unanimously adopted the same provision last Friday, in exactly the same form, as an amendment to the lend-lease bill, as I have already stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) to permit additional sales of wheat for feed, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a declaration of principles recently adopted by the American Agricultural Institute.

There being no objection, the declaration of principles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The increase and dissemination of information in the fields of agricultural science and economics.

2. Adequate production on American farms and in American factories.

3. Recognition of the right of American producers to the American markets, and full protection of such rights.

4. Support of sound cooperative associations.

5. Continued study of the problem of securing for agriculture its fair share of the national income in peacetime as well as war, and of efforts to bring about a just and permanent solution.

6. A better understanding between agriculture, industry, and labor, with mutual confidence, respect, and cooperation.

7. Protection of individual rights and liberties. Encouragement of individual initiative. Support of the doctrine of self-help.

8. The right of every man to sell his services or his products without interference, and to increase his earning power by improving his skill or increasing his output.

9. Evaluating every business institution or activity by the service it renders to society.

10. The best possible transportation facilities, at the lowest costs consistent with good service. Impartial encouragement of rail, water, highway, and air transport, and coordination where possible.

11. Restriction of governmental activities to the legitimate and necessary functions of government. Abolition of unnecessary bureaus, boards, commissions, and authorities. A simplified but effective regulatory system, with industry and labor subject to equal controls, and assuming equal responsibility.

12. Rigid control of Federal, State, and local governmental expenditures. An equitable taxation system, with levies held to the lowest possible levels.

13. Preservation of American institutions and the American way of life.

14. Promotion of international commerce and good will.

The board of directors announce that plans are under way for extending and enlarging the research and educational work of this organization. A long-time program for the economic and social welfare of agriculture is being developed. The Institute hopes to make substantial contribution to the national effort to avoid a repetition, in the coming post-war period, of the disastrous experience of agriculture following World War No. 1.

#### EFFECTS OF ROLL-BACKS AND SUBSIDIES ON FOOD PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 6, 1943, discussing the disastrous effects of roll-backs and subsidies on food production, and two letters on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF MOUNT UNION COLLEGE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement day address entitled "Look Up America, Look Up!" delivered by him at Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio, on June 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCFARLAND BEFORE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MCFARLAND at the Forty-eighth National Memorial Service of Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in New York City, May 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ENLARGEMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY—STATEMENTS BY WILLIAM GREEN AND PHILIP MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements by

William Green and Philip Murray, and an editorial in the Washington Daily News, concerning the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### UNIFORM OPENING OF POLLS ON ELECTION DAY

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial concerning pending legislation providing for the uniform opening of the polls on election day, published in the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of \$4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the nature of a substitute.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is entirely satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making agricultural appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, line 11, after the word "amended", it is proposed to strike out "Provided further, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938" and in lieu thereof to insert "Provided further, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law No. 147, 77th Cong.): Provided further, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity for distribution exclusively for relief purposes, nor to commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or are sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rub-

ber, or the extraction of oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or commodities sold for export or new or byproduct uses: Provided further, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: Provided further, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think this is the amendment which I asked to have go over until today.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I did not make the request in my own capacity, but a Senator who was absent yesterday and is absent today asked me to have the amendment go over. I am advised through his office that he has no objection to the amendment. Therefore I am willing that action be taken without further discussion, so far as that Senator is concerned and so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia if this is the amendment on page 66 restoring the parity-price provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment is found on page 66 of the bill, and it is practically the same language as that carried in the present appropriation law, under which the Commodity Credit Corporation is now functioning, the difference being that last year the Senate committee placed a limitation of 125,000,000 bushels on the quantity of wheat that could be sold for feed. Early in this year the feed situation became so acute throughout the country that it was necessary to pass an act permitting the sale of another 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] a few moments ago presented and the Senate passed a House joint resolution permitting the sale of 50,000,000 more bushels of wheat for feed between now and the beginning of the next fiscal year. The provision of the committee amendment as it applies to next year contains no limitation on the amount of wheat which may be sold for feed. Today a very acute condition prevails throughout the entire country, and there is an unquestioned need for more feed for livestock and poultry, due to the unusual demands of the war for foodstuffs.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any objection to the committee amendment. As yet none has been raised. Even those who opposed a similar provision which was placed in the bill last year have favored legislation subsequently enacted increasing the amount of wheat which would be available for this purpose.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Georgia for the information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 68, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$400,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 68, line 3, after "\$400,000,000", to strike out the comma and the words "to remain available until June 30, 1945, solely for programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for compliances with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, pursuant to 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive," and in lieu thereof to insert a comma and the words, "to remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has the amendment at the top of page 68 been acted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, that amendment was agreed to. Does the Senator wish that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered?

Mr. BYRD. I simply wanted to express my opposition to the increase from \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000. I think the time has come when the farmers, instead of being given subsidies, should have an increased price for their products. I do not intend to ask for a ye-a-and-nay vote on this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will do so, because I think it is important that the question be voted on. I hope that even if it be by voice vote only, a vote will be taken on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia desire that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered?

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment appearing in line 2 on page 68 was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD. I am opposed to the Senate committee amendment. I am willing to support a \$300,000,000 appropriation, as provided by the appropriations bill as passed by the House, but I think that is a sufficient amount, and that we should not increase it to \$400,000,000. The time has come when we should give the farmers a reasonable and proper price for their products and eliminate subsidies. If we cannot eliminate them now, I do not think we can ever do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we naturally feel reluctant during time of war to change the system which has been in effect and which primarily was introduced as a depression aid to agriculture. However, today all the money which is appropriated in this bill for any purpose whatsoever is borrowed money. The



Government is not taking in sufficient money to pay for its war effort, and of course agriculture is a part of its war effort, but not primarily a governmentally operated war effort, because the farmer is an individual businessman. If he needs \$300,000,000 for aid in one way or another, it seems to me that in these times the prices he receives should be fair and should furnish the aid, and it should not be sought through an indirect appropriation by the Government, which only adds to the national debt.

Let me briefly illustrate, that if \$400,000,000 is appropriated a year for this purpose, and the war lasts 3 years, it means that a sum in excess of \$1,000,000,000 will be added to the national debt, which the returning troops, as well as our own generation, and perhaps future generations, will have to pay. I think we have reached the point in these times when a great many of the depression agencies should be eliminated. I do not believe it is sound to carry them through this period. If after the war is over, we fall into a period of business depression, as is not unlikely, pending the readjustment, and have to establish these agencies and functions over again, that is one thing, but I believe we have today reached the point where many of the depression-created agencies and functions should be reduced or eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to repeat the statement I made yesterday in regard to this item. For a number of years this appropriation for soil conservation payments to farmers has been \$500,000,000. Last year it was reduced to \$450,000,000. This year the Bureau of the Budget reduced the amount to \$400,000,000. To assure a further reduction next year language has been placed in the bill as it appears at the bottom of page 69, which provides that the program for the next fiscal year cannot amount to more than \$300,000,000.

There is more involved in this matter, Mr. President, than any mere question of substance, as stated by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Virginia. These payments are made to farmers for following certain soil-conserving practices on their lands. The program was announced in December 1942, and was carried into every agricultural county in the United States. The farmers were told that if they would follow certain practices with regard to soil conservation and the handling of crops, they would receive certain payments this year. That announcement had been made each year for the 6 previous years. The farmers in many cases, on practically 6,000,000 farms in the country, acting upon the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, have expended large sums of money in buying the material which was necessary to be had in order to comply with the program. Of course, the Congress can break that contract with the farmers; it can say it has no sanction of law. That is a debatable question. However, my own construction of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is that the Sec-

retary of Agriculture is required to make the announcement to the farmers, and I think the Congress is morally bound to make the appropriations. Approximately \$200,000,000 of this money represents what are in effect out-of-pocket expenditures by the farmers in order to carry on the soil-conservation practices, and in no event can properly be considered a subsidy.

The program has been reduced from year to year, as I have outlined. It may be that these questions pertaining to agriculture are of no importance in time of war; but I think they are of just as vital importance as the production of planes and tanks; because all the equipment obtained with the moneys which are expended for military purposes—and yesterday afternoon we passed an appropriation of more than \$20,000,000,000 for the Navy Department, and not a word was said or not an objection was raised as to a single item in the bill—is not worth 2 cents to us without adequate food and clothing to take care of the men who are to operate the machinery.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said the farmers were promised \$200,000,000. Who, except the Congress of the United States, has the authority to promise an appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, evidently the Senator did not follow my remarks. I said the question as to whether the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to promise those payments to farmers was a debatable one.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Constitution authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to obligate the Congress to make an appropriation from year to year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the passage of the War Department appropriation bill and the Navy Department appropriation bill we have authorized contractual obligations running into the tens of billions of dollars.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not contend that we have authorized a contractual obligation with respect to soil conservation; does he?

Mr. RUSSELL. Most assuredly I do. It is my construction of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 that, within the limit of appropriations authorized by law—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is exactly the point. Without authorization by law an appropriation of \$400,000,000 could be said to be just as much an obligation as an appropriation of \$200,000,000. Does the Senator contend that the Congress is obligated to appropriate \$200,000,000 for this activity?

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that so long as we have adopted language, as we have, limiting the amount to \$300,000,000 for next year, the Secretary of Agriculture is obligated to make the expenditures in conformity with the authorization and the announcements.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator find that particular point in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, while the Senator is finding it, will he yield to me so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The money is for payments in the next fiscal year—

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it is to carry out the program authorized for this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be so, when shall we reach the point of being able to reduce the appropriation, if we can only follow in line with the commitments made?

Mr. RUSSELL. The provision is—

That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 program or plans hereafter authorized under section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator, if he will yield to me at that point. Did I understand him to say the 1944 appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is for next year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. We appropriate in the 1944 appropriation bill to pay for this year's program; and that is why I say it would be a breach of faith to appropriate less than the farmers have been led to believe they will receive. I was showing the Senator how we were undertaking to limit the appropriation for next year without any breach of faith.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. First, I should like to read the remainder of the paragraph:

the total expenditures of which including administration shall not exceed \$300,000,000.

At least by such action, which would be a limitation on an appropriation—a clumsy way to approach the problem, but the only approach we had—we would undertake to assure a reduction of \$100,000,000 in the appropriation next year.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am getting at is whether, if that appropriation is put in the bill, when this time next year comes, we shall have to appropriate more money because the Secretary of Agriculture will have bound us in connection with the program and commitments for the following year. Shall we have to do that?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because in the bill we limit to not exceeding \$300,000,000 the total expenses which are to be made in promulgating the program.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, if the Secretary of Agriculture were to carry the program to a point involving appropriations beyond the amount of the appropriations we authorize, he would do so at his peril, and the Congress would not be bound to appropriate any further money for soil-conservation payments; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely.

Mr. TYDINGS. Am I to understand that the Senator's statement is that if the Secretary of Agriculture perhaps incurred an obligation to carry out the

program, he will have been circumscribed and curtailed by the limiting language to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly the purpose of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that, hereafter, Congress could refuse to appropriate any money for this function, if it deemed such a course to be wise; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could do that now. As a matter of fact, all the work sheets issued to the 6,000,000 farmers throughout the United States carry a statement that the offer is made subject to appropriations to be made by the Congress. There is no question about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree as to that. However, the point is that when those work sheets are issued, the farmer has a right to believe that the Congress will back up what its servant, the Secretary of Agriculture, is attempting to do.

What I should like to know is whether the work sheets will go out again next year. If they do go out, shall we not be in the same position next year we are in now?

Mr. RUSSELL. Within the limitation of this amendment, because we put them on notice, and notify the Secretary of Agriculture that he should not enter into a program next year that will cost more than \$300,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why limit it to \$300,000,000? What is the magic of that figure?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because we were endeavoring to reduce appropriations, not to strike down all the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, let me say that if the Congress wants to abolish the program it should do so with a limitation now that will provide that no payments shall be made next year. I am opposed to such a course. I think it would be a mistake, even in time of war, to strike down the program.

However, if the Congress should decide that it desired to strike down the program, it should place a limitation in the bill to the effect that no part of the funds should be available for formulating a program next year that would cost one dime, instead of taking the money out of appropriations made to apply to contracts which already have been entered into in good faith by the farmers.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can appreciate the sense of the Senator's statement, to wit—that after we have made agreements in one form or another with the farmers, the Congress would not be keeping faith if it did not appropriate the money. I can understand that; but I am curious to know how we can get in a position so that, if we desire to change or amend or alter the program, or even eliminate it, that can be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are two ways by which that could be done. One would be by repealing the section of the act of April 27, 1935, which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to incur obligations not exceeding \$500,000,000 for any one fiscal year for this program. The other would be by placing in this appropriation bill a limitation which would prohibit

the formulation of any program whatever for next year. Of course, I should be opposed to either of those courses.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I do not have detailed information on these matters. I think the Senator from Georgia is one of the best-informed Members of Congress on this whole program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish I could deserve the Senator's encomium.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure the Senator deserves it, and I commend him for his long and tireless efforts in behalf of agriculture—efforts which I think have been in almost all cases constructive, as I view the picture. But all the money being paid out on the soil-conservation program is not, in my judgment, achieving the results for which it has been paid out. For example, many farmers are doing what they previously were doing, and are collecting the payments for adhering to certain practices which they have been employing for generations.

I understand that there are certain places where these practices have not been put into effect and where this program is being used as an educational program in order to bring the soil to a point of higher fertility. I cannot speak for many States, but I think that generally in the East—in New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and some of the other nearby States—most of the soil-conservation practices have been used by the farmers for many years. In the future, where the fruits of the educational program are being borne, I think we might consider limiting it and applying it only to sections of the country where it is not practiced. What we are doing today in many communities under the guise of soil-conservation payments is simply paying farmers for doing exactly what they have been doing for 15, 20, or 40 years.

That being the case, I would rather see the prices of farm products sufficiently high to compensate the farmer for the expenses to which he is put, rather than to have indirect subsidies paid as a means of lowering the prices. The farmer is entitled to no more than a fair price, and he is entitled to no less than a fair price; but, in the long run, all these indirect payments from the Federal Treasury, added to the national debt, will do the farmer more harm than if we were to proceed, so far as possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis, because the farmer will have to make his contribution to the whole debt structure. Therefore we are not quite candid when we let him believe that he is getting something for nothing, because in the end, like every other workingman, whether he be on the farm or in the factory, he will have to pay his share if our bank deposits and the integrity of our financial structure are to remain unharmed. There is no other way to do it. Therefore I am hopeful that the amount will be reduced in line with what the Senator from Virginia has recommended, because I think the curtailment ought to take place now, while farm prices, on the whole, are good, and when we can reduce this expenditure without hurting the farmer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have been discussing the amendment on page 68, line 2, under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources." The House provided an appropriation of \$300,000,000. The Senate committee has raised the amount to \$400,000,000.

On page 74 of the bill we find the heading "Soil Conservation Service." The total appropriation recommended for that Service is \$21,850,136. What is the difference between the purposes of the two provisions?

Mr. RUSSELL. Both programs have the same objective, but it is approached from different standpoints. The appropriation which the committee is seeking, of \$400,000,000, is to pay the individual farmers the amounts which they were assured they would receive when the work sheets were issued to the local A. A. A. committees last December. That is for the work the farmer does on his land.

The whole philosophy of the Soil Conservation Act was that the Nation had a stake in preserving the fertility of the soil, so as to assure that in years to come the soil will not become so depleted that it cannot produce adequate supplies of food to take care of an increasing population.

The Soil Conservation Service item to which the Senator refers is the technical service in the Department of Agriculture. It makes investigations and furnishes information to farmers as to methods of soil conservation to pursue.

Furthermore, I believe 43 of the States have enacted State laws providing for the establishment of soil-conservation districts. Whenever the farmers within a certain area, at an election duly held, vote for the creation of a soil-conservation district, the lands within that area are subject to a certain program. The appropriation of \$21,850,136 to which the Senator refers is for the technical force in the field, in the soil-conservation districts, to serve each individual farm and make suggestions to the farmer as to the soil-conservation practices he should pursue. A map is made of each farm. Suppose a farm consists of 60 acres. The map will show the lands which the expert from the Soil Conservation Service regards as suitable to be devoted to crops. Suggestions will be made as to planting wood lots or trees in a certain area which is not susceptible to cultivation. Advice is given and surveys are made for the erection of terraces, to see that the soil of the entire farm is properly drained and not eroded because of improper terracing and drainage.

That is the difference. The Soil Conservation Service deals with the soil-conservation districts and with the technical aspects of the problem, making research into soil-conservation practices. The other item is for payment to the farmers for carrying out those practices.



Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, both appropriations are, in fact, really under the same head.

Mr. RUSSELL. Both have the same objective, which is conserving and preserving the fertility of the soil on the farms of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why are the items divided in this manner?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a question of opinion. Congress has enacted various laws. All of this program is authorized by acts of Congress. I believe the items were divided in this manner because the Congress would have been hesitant to place a compulsory program upon the several States and incorporate them into soil-conservation districts. Therefore Congress enacted legislation inviting the States to hold elections within the watersheds to determine whether or not the farmers would go into the soil-conservation districts.

The other appropriation applies to the individual farmer. He may carry out the practices suggested, or he may not carry them out. The option is with him, whereas in the soil-conservation districts, when three-fourths of the farmers or landowners in a certain area so vote, all are bound to carry out certain soil-conservation practices.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In the last analysis, however, we appropriate a little more than \$420,000,000 for this single purpose, under these two items.

Mr. RUSSELL. For the objective of conserving the soils of the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. How much of the \$400,000,000 is used for the type of payment which it is sought to deduct in determining parity prices? What is that program called?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the present Executive order all these funds may be deducted in price fixing. As a matter of fact, they are not now all deducted. As to these funds that order is an injustice, and I hope they will not be deducted. A large part of these payments are to reimburse the farmer for out-of-pocket expenditures and to deduct them has the effect of fixing his prices below parity and causes him an actual loss.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, when a farmer does certain specific things on his farm, or installs certain kinds of improvements, those are not taken into consideration specifically, but there is a general payment program. Is most of the \$400,000,000 used for what, in effect, is a subsidy for particular crops?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. As I recall, \$197,000,000 would go for the general soil-conservation practices, such as liming, planting trees, and building terraces. So much per running foot is allowed for terraces of a certain height. Then there is the administration expense, which next year would be limited to not more than \$32,500,000. That would leave approximately \$160,000,000 for payments for the other purpose to which the Senator refers, less than half the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Referring to the provision at the top of page 69, it reads:

*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$32,500,000 of said amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs.

Does that mean that a general administrative pay roll of \$32,500,000 is required to operate this \$400,000,000 program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has heard previous discussion on that subject. Of course, there is a limitation on the amount which may be expended in the District of Columbia. I was the author of that amendment some years ago. I thought the administrative expenses were too high. In some cases the expenses of the local county committees have been perfectly staggering. For the current year all expenses of administration amount to approximately \$54,000,000. We are trying to reduce those expenses. We think they are excessive. In some areas the county committees would meet only a very few days during the year, to formulate the program and see that it was enforced. In other cases they would meet as many as 100 days a year. We are seeking to reduce the administrative expenses from \$54,000,000 this year to \$32,500,000 next year. That applies to all the locally elected county committeemen in every county of the United States where there is any agricultural interest, as well as the community committees, and all other administrative expenses. As the Senator knows, this program is broken down into the community committeemen, the county committeemen, the county representatives, and the Washington office.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do not many of these committees do various other things besides attending to soil conservation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do they not do many things which they are not supposed to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that they do. I have not heretofore heard that charge made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is this not the group which has been repeatedly charged with widespread propaganda, to such an extent that recently the Secretary of Agriculture had to chastise them?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there has been a terrific fight in some States between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service on the one side, and the triple A committees on the other side. I think that is not true throughout the entire United States, but it has been true in some cases, I will say, in all frankness to the Senator from Michigan. In defending their conduct of the program, the triple A committeemen criticized the Extension Service and the Farm Bureau, and their ideas in taking over the program. There has been quite a political fight between those agencies. I do not think it has been a partisan matter. I do not think there is any line of demarcation between Democrats and Republicans. It

has been a fight waged for power between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service, on the one side, and the triple A committees on the other, as to who should administer and control the farm program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the Senator from Georgia, the expense of administration for the past year reached \$54,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Out of a total expense of how much?

Mr. RUSSELL. Out of \$450,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And the committee found that to be indefensible, and tried to reduce it to \$32,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; we thought it excessive.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why is \$32,500,000 the figure? Is not that still a tremendously extravagant figure for administrative expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot answer the question categorically. The Senator from Michigan knows that in trying to bring about reductions, it is sometimes necessary more or less to use a rule of thumb. I think the committee seized upon that figure because some officials of the farm organizations, when they appeared before the committee, said that they did not believe that in any event the appropriation for administrative expenses should be reduced below that amount.

My judgment is that this program should be administered, and can be administered, with approximately \$25,000,000, but I do not think that the committee would be justified in making such a drastic reduction in 1 year. I believe that it would be better to reduce the amount from \$54,000,000 to \$32,500,000, and next year try to reduce it to approximately \$25,000,000. That is my own view. I am not attempting to express the view of others. I do not know what prompted the committee to adopt the figure of \$32,500,000 unless someone in the committee—I may have been the culprit—thought that that was the amount suggested by the Farm Bureau as the minimum amount upon which the program could be administered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am glad that the committee is starting to curb this particular item. It seems to me totally indefensible to think of a 10 percent administrative charge against a farm encouragement program. I think if the Senator should suggest \$25,000,000 he might find many other Senators agreeing with him right now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like to propound an inquiry. Assuming the analysis of the matter which the Senator has given to be accurate—I am sure that he believes it to be correct—I should like to have him explain why the House feels that this program could be carried out with an appropriation of only \$300,000,000 and why the Senate committee feels that an appropriation of \$400,000,000 is

necessary to meet our commitments, in line with the Senator's explanation of those commitments which he gave a few minutes ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I do not know what prompted the House to reduce the amount to \$300,000,000. I read the record. No real reason was given, other than that some Member of the House expressed the fear on the floor that some of these funds would be paid out for incentive payments. There was also an impression abroad that if these payments were made to farmers for carrying out this program, it would be like putting money into one pocket, and then, under the price-fixing theory, the farmer would be denied the money by having the payments deducted before his ceiling prices were established, thereby taking it out of the other pocket.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be treated as a subsidy.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. That is my impression as to what prompted the House in doing what it did. However, Mr. President, I will say that if I should undertake to explain what motivated the House in its action on this bill I would be attempting something which I believe no man could possibly do. In the shape in which the bill came to the Senate, that would be impossible.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Georgia has given a very fair explanation of the situation, but my own opposition springs primarily from the fact that I think it would be a very serious mistake now to embrace a system of what would amount almost to direct subsidy payments. That is one reason why I shall support the \$300,000,000 appropriation rather than the \$400,000,000, in the belief that in the final result agriculture itself would be better served than by pursuing the opposite course.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope that no Member of the Senate will get the impression from the Senator's remarks that we are embarking on any new program under the proposed \$400,000,000 appropriation. The plan is merely to carry out a program announced last December to the farmers of the country, and represents a reduction of \$100,000,000 in the funds available year before last.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In line with what the Senator from Michigan has said, I should like to relate two instances which may have some explanatory effect in connection with the size of the administrative expense.

Two years ago the Department of Agriculture brought a party of approximately 600 persons, representing the Department in many sections of the United States to the State of South Dakota, and spent nearly a week there, partly in vacationing and partly in conferences.

From the Senator's explanation, I assume that the expense of that activity was met from the fund for administrative expense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all the administrative expenses of this program are paid by the farmer because of the fact the expenses are deducted from the appropriations made for payments to the farmer. Under the policy which the Department was finally prevailed upon to adopt, each farmer was supposed to be shown on his check what proportion had been deducted for administrative expenses of the Triple A.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then the farmer has not been receiving all the money he should have received?

Mr. RUSSELL. That does not follow at all.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to relate another incident. About the same time as the occurrence to which I have referred, the Secretary of Agriculture who was then in office held a meeting in the city of St. Paul, or Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota. Representatives of the Department went into my State, as well as adjoining States, and solicited people to go to St. Paul or Minneapolis to hear the Secretary speak.

A special train went from the section of the State in which I live, and all expenses were paid to St. Paul. Was that expense a part of the administrative expense which we are discussing?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never previously heard of that incident. I think the Senator should have come before the Committee on Appropriations and told us about it so that we could have had an opportunity to investigate. I would have appreciated hearing about it. I certainly do not consider such expenses a proper part of the administrative expense of this program. I do not believe any Member of the Senate would.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to endorse the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan that if the amount were reduced to \$25,000,000 we might agree to it more readily.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made the point that \$32,000,000 is the total of the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture. It is my understanding that \$32,000,000 is for the payment of per diems and expenses of the 90,000 committeemen. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think not. That amount includes all administrative expenses, in Washington and elsewhere.

Mr. BYRD. It could not possibly include all administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. BYRD. The Department of Agriculture has 76,624 regular employees, in addition to the 90,000 committeemen. Last year there was actually expended \$42,000,000 for compensation to committeemen, so the amount stated could not possibly include all the administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. It includes all the expenses of the Triple A. That is what is dealt with in this item.

Mr. BYRD. I was talking about the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it does not include all the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. Under the pending bill what would the 90,000 committeemen be permitted to withdraw from the Treasury?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no idea what they would be permitted to withdraw from the Treasury, because we have reduced the appropriation so that no more than \$32,500,000 may be spent. I do not know how much of this would go for the committee's expense.

Mr. BYRD. Does that have reference to the committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That is for all the Triple A administrative expenses.

Mr. BYRD. What will the Triple A cost for the present year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately \$54,000,000. I do not have all the figures before me now.

Mr. BYRD. Does not that all go to the committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department is limited to \$32,500,000 for Washington in the field and for the committeemen under the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. How many regular employees have they?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures, and I cannot tell the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I do not want to contradict the Senator from Georgia, but the committeemen drew—

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I insist that the administrative expenses for the Triple A program, wherever they are, are contained in this \$32,500,000 appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. Ninety thousand committeemen have been drawing per diem for traveling around the country as they please, going here and there, for a great many years, and last year they drew out of the Treasury \$42,000,000. That is a matter of record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not prepared to controvert that, but we are trying to cut it down to such a point that compensation for the committeemen and all other administrative expenses including those in Washington could not exceed \$32,500,000.

Mr. BYRD. Is that in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is in the bill. We have been discussing it on the floor. If the Senator will look at the top of page 69 he will find the limitation. We are trying to limit and reduce the expenses of the Triple A.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator if he made any investigation of communications expenses of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I have the figures here.

Mr. BYRD. For 5 months, from July 1 to December 1, 1942, their expenditures for telephone and telegraph service were \$1,153,000. Does that conform with the Senator's record?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures for 6 months. I find that the communications services for the entire Department for the whole fiscal year 1943



were, approximately, \$2,000,000. So the Senator's figure is about correct for 6 months.

Mr. BYRD. For communications by long-distance telephone for 6 months the expenditure was \$736,000. That would be a million and a half dollars for the year.

For travel expenses the Department of Agriculture expended \$5,175,796 for 6 months, or in excess of \$10,000,000 on a yearly basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am trying to find the figures as to travel expenses. I think the Senator's figures are about correct.

Mr. BYRD. Then, the paid employees with the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the committeemen, number 76,624.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's figures with regard to travel expenses are approximately correct.

Mr. BYRD. Has the committee made any attempt, in this bill, to reduce travel expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; travel expenses are reduced. The Senator will recall that last year we made a reduction in travel expenses in several items spread throughout the bill; we made a small further reduction this year.

Mr. BYRD. Is that contained in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not as a specific item. It appears in the Budget estimates.

Mr. BYRD. There has been a reduction of travel expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a substantial reduction in the 1943 bill over the preceding year, and we have reduced it almost half a million dollars more in the current bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand from the Senator's statement that a good deal of the money which has been appropriated has really been expended already on the promise by the Secretary of Agriculture that it would be forthcoming or in the belief that it would be forthcoming.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is undoubtedly true; large sums have been expended by farmers throughout the country on the assurance that they would be reimbursed from the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. TUNNELL. Lime has been bought, I take it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Lime and trees, and terracing practices have been carried out, involving a considerable expense.

Mr. TUNNELL. The farmers of the Nation had reason to believe that the necessary amounts would be appropriated by Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. They had reason, based upon the construction of the act I read a few moments ago, and on the fact that for 6 years Congress had appropriated funds sufficient to discharge the obligations of the Department of Agriculture to the farmers.

Mr. TUNNELL. And a refusal to appropriate now would fall upon the farmers who have already spent the money and who believed that they would be reimbursed?

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly, in part, that would be the effect of it, because it would be undertaking to discharge a dollar debt, as I see it, by the payment of 75 cents. It is true that we are at war, but I do not see any reason why, if we can pass a bill appropriating approximately \$24,000,000,000 for the Navy in 15 minutes, we should attempt to make a reduction in the payment of funds to the farmers who have already expended in many cases funds out of their own pocket. It is not fair; indeed, it is a breach of faith to the farmers of this country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with respect to this issue, I agree in principle with the Senator from Maryland and also the Senator from Virginia. I hope to see the day come when we will abandon this kind of a program, but, in view of the obligation that has either been expressly incurred or exists by strong implication, we would be breaking faith if we did not appropriate sufficient money to carry out the program which has been established and under which the farmers have operated this year. Is it the judgment of the Senator and the judgment of the committee that it will take \$400,000,000 to discharge that obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The best authority the committee has is the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production, both of whom appeared before the committee and said that the announcement which was made to the farmers last year contemplated the payment of \$400,000,000, and that the appropriation of less than that amount would not enable the Department to meet the obligations which were incurred when the program was formulated last December.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if we reduced it now to \$300,000,000, we would be breaking faith to the extent of about 25 percent of our obligations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly so understand the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. With respect to the amendment the committee has incorporated in the bill dealing with 1944, it is attempted by that method, rather than by repealing the section of the A. A. A. statute, to continue further to reduce the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are undertaking to assure that the program next year will be reduced \$100,000,000 and will not exceed \$300,000,000, under the language the committee has recommended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. With this amendment in the bill the Secretary of Agriculture and no one else would be authorized to obligate the Government beyond \$300,000,000 to the farmer, and the Senator now understands that that would be the limit of next year's program?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what the committee is proposing and trying to do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to commend the committee and the Senator for what I regard as a progressive step to get rid of some of these programs.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Perhaps the Senator answered the question I am about to ask before I came into the Chamber; but did the Senator state the reason which induced the committee to drop the House proviso that no part of this appropriation should be used for incentive payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to refer to that; I have not touched on it, and I shall be glad to tell the Senator the reason. The committee struck that provision because nobody on the committee knew exactly what it meant. I should like to have any Senator define for me exactly what is meant by the words "no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purpose of making incentive payments."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the background of this situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was going to explain that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to put in the Senator's mind an idea which he can consider when he explains the matter. I interpret that language to mean that the Secretary could go ahead with soil-building and conservation programs, but he could not use this money as an inducement to farmers to plant a particular crop by promising to give them so much a bushel, for example, or so much a ton; but the money would have to be spent for soil-building and conservation programs. I think that is reasonable. If that is the limitation and that is the interpretation of the provision, I should be inclined to support it. If, however, we are to have a soil-conservation program which will be so hamstrung that it cannot be carried out, then I should not want to support it. I hope the Senator will explain it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to explain it so far as I can, but, frankly, I do not know what the effect of the language will be. I think I know the reasons why the House put the provision in the bill. The Budget submitted estimates to the House of Representatives for \$100,000,000, and in endeavoring to describe the payments which are to be made from the \$100,000,000, the Department of Agriculture, in making up the Budget, referred to the payments as "incentive payments." That appropriation was rejected by the House, and the Senate committee has not undertaken to insert it in the bill. However, this statement of the reasons for the insertion of the provision is a mere conjecture on my part. The House was opposed to those payments and used the same term to describe them in the limitation.

I can conceive of a situation in which it would be impossible even to make a

soil-conservation payment if this language were contained in the law, because a soil-conservation payment is in the nature of an incentive payment. It is paid as an incentive for the farmer to improve his land. The appropriation which the committee is recommending is for the purpose of meeting obligations entered into last December. I could see no good reason for cluttering up the bill with language which no one could clearly understand or define.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that if the word "direct" were inserted in the bill before the word "incentive," the Department of Agriculture, with the rulings of its own attorney, who would be favorably inclined toward the provision, would interpret it as Congress means that it should be interpreted—namely, that the money shall not be used directly as a part of the price, per se, for the production of crops, and I think even those who are its greatest friends, or those moderately inclined toward it, are not voting for it as money to be used for incentive payments. I think we are voting it to be used for soil-conservation practices, and I believe we would be wise to reinsert the House provision and, if necessary, make it plainer than it is in the words of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that we are dealing here with a very complex problem. The soil-conservation payments are not made only to the producers of basic commodities, they are made also to dairy farmers, they are made in small programs affecting only commodities having a limited production area scale. For example, the law applies in some way to the naval stores program in my own State. Some small payments are made there out of this fund. I think we would be doing a very dangerous thing if we put this limitation on an appropriation to pay for a program which has already been promulgated by the Department and carried out by the farmer. If we insert this limitation on this appropriation, we are likely to cause some rulings or interpretations which would prevent the farmer from being paid funds which are due him now. If it is to be inserted in the bill, it should be inserted as applying on the program for next year, not to tie this program down by language which is not applicable to it, which no one clearly understands. I doubt whether any man living could now predict the effect this language might have on these payments.

We are not undertaking a new program, we are complying with the program which was announced to the farmer last December and on which the farmers signed worksheets before they planted their crops this year. Payments have to be made for this purpose, because that is the program which was announced, and if we are undertaking to control the program in the future, the language should be put at the bottom of page 69, in the committee provision affecting the program next year, because I do not know what would be construed to be in-

centive payments; the Senator from Maryland does not know, and no one else knows. The Senator knows what he has in mind, and I know what I have in mind, but when in an appropriation bill reported to the Senate we are defining something which has not been defined by statute, we are doing a very dangerous thing, because this program has many ramifications, and applies to many commodities throughout the country other than wheat, corn, and cotton.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad the Senator made the explanation as lucidly as he has made it, as he always does explain a matter, because it was evident to me that there was a widespread feeling throughout the country that the purpose of the provision inserted in the bill by the House was to prevent the payment of the so-called subsidy payments. The use of the term "incentive payment" raised the question that is in the Senator's mind, which he has just presented to the Senate, that a soil-conservation payment is an incentive payment. But there is a deep-rooted and bitter antagonism in the Congress toward the payment of subsidies, or to the diversion of funds appropriated for specific purposes to pay subsidy payments, as a policy.

I have in mind that that was the motivating thought in the House when it put this provision into the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say that I did make inquiry as to whether there was going to be any undertaking to switch these funds from the purposes announced last December to any new purpose, and I was assured that no such idea was contemplated, that they would be used for the purposes announced when the Secretary announced the program last December.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has answered my question. I could not see where there would be any authority, even if the House amendment were eliminated, to use for the payment of direct subsidies funds appropriated specifically for soil building and conservation purposes, and, in my humble judgment, if that is done, it will be an affront to the intent and will of the Congress, and without any authority of law. In view of the Senator's explanation, and the general understanding that these funds are not to be diverted in whole or in part, having gotten that from the administrative authorities, we might with some reasonable degree of assurance assume that the funds will not be used in the payment of direct subsidies for crops.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not undertake to say that not one dollar of this fund would be expended for what some might term a subsidy payment, but it will not be expended under the new program; it will be used in the program that was announced last December, before the submission of the extra Budget estimates for the so-called incentive payments, which were regarded as a

direct subsidy. This program affects a great many commodities, and I am not advised as to how it all is to be applied, but I do know that it is to be applied only in conformity with the regular soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program that was announced by the Secretary last December, and that none of the money is to be diverted for any new purpose or any new program.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It has been suggested repeatedly this morning by the able Senator from Georgia, and I believe by the able Senator from Arkansas, that there would be some breaking of faith if we should not pass this appropriation bill with the \$400,000,000 item in it. I should like to be advised upon what ground that statement is made. What assurance has Congress given that this appropriation would be made at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I read the statute once, but I shall read it again. It appears in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and is the last section in it. After stating the payments which the Secretary may make, and the obligations he may incur for various purposes, for the planting of pasture land, range land, and for the planting of forests, and general soil-conservation practices, this language occurs:

Mr. REVERCOMB. But was not an appropriation made?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I am reading the language of the obligations:

The obligations incurred for the purpose of carrying out, for any calendar year, the provisions of section 590g, 590h, 590i, 590j, 590k, 590n, of this title shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

That is the language on which the Secretary relied for his authority. It may be a debatable question. I expressed it as my opinion that the Congress authorized the Secretary to promulgate the program. Any other Senator, of course, has a right to a contrary view.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator from Georgia hold that that would be a recurring obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. For 6 years we have been making appropriations to fulfill the obligation. Congress has followed that policy for 6 years, and appropriated the full amount of payment to farmers that the Secretary has obligated. This is the first year any question has been raised concerning the authority of the Secretary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator contend that there is a recurring obligation from year to year to appropriate \$500,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do, and I pointed out to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that it was my opinion that the only way that situation can be relieved is by repealing the statute, or by, as in this bill, limiting the amount to the appropriation for next year. I think this matter is similar to the provision with respect to appropriation of one-third of the customs receipts to the Department of Agriculture. That is done



by permanent statute. There is not even an appropriation item in this bill carrying those funds, because 10 years ago Congress passed an act providing that one-third of the funds collected from customs receipts shall be paid over as a continuing appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for specific purposes. That item is not even in the bill. Yet the Senator says that Congress cannot authorize such matters. We have done it in that particular case. I think we had a right to do it in that case, and we have passed bills year after year which authorized the making of contractual obligations by various departments. It has run into the billions in authorizing contracts for ships as provided in one bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I must say in all candor to the Senator that I cannot follow his reasoning that when a statute is enacted providing that the Secretary of Agriculture may expend \$500,000,000 under the law passed in that year—

Mr. RUSSELL. It says "obligate." It does not say "expend."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Obligate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot follow the Senator's reasoning that that would be a recurring obligation from year to year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That represents a difference of opinion. My viewpoint is that it is a recurring obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 68, line 2, to strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$400,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Elliander	Moore	Wherry
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the time available for final passage of the bill is so short, and that its consideration in conference will be so involved, I think the Senate conferees are entitled to know the sentiment on this question. Therefore, I ask for

the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will inform me regarding one or two points.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the \$400,000,000 appropriation includes almost \$200,000,000 which is to be paid to farmers for not producing more than their acreage allotment. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not exactly correct. Some of the money is to be paid to farmers under the program which has been in effect. That provides for the limitation of acreage planted to some commodities.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not talking about the program which has been in effect; but I think I am correct in stating that a large proportion of the money—upward of \$200,000,000—is to be paid to farmers for not planting such crops on more than a certain amount of acreage on their farms. That is the rule in my State, and I think it is the rule in the Senator's State. So I understand that the program is to be used in part to restrict the production of certain crops; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the only crops which are under marketing quotas at the present time are cotton and tobacco.

In the program this year, as I understand, there is no limitation on the acreage of wheat or corn which can be planted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us take cotton, alone. Is it not a fact that if a farmer plants only so much of his acreage in cotton he gets a part of the money, under the program, whereas, if he plants his acreage as he sees fit, to cotton, without limit to the acreage put in cotton, he does not get a part of the money?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct in part.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that those procedures are not soil-conservation processes. They involve nothing more than utilization of the money to restrict the acreage planted to certain crops. As I recall, even in Maryland, a farmer can plant only so much acreage in corn and only so much acreage in wheat, if he desires to receive a soil-conservation check.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is in error about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I myself received this spring one of the questionnaires which had to be signed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator got it on last year's payment and last year's crop, too.

Mr. TYDINGS. It showed how much was allowed to be planted in a certain crop; and if more than that acreage was planted in the crop, the payment would not be received. That is my recollection of the questionnaire.

Mr. RUSSELL. That procedure has been used.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be true, there is no use in calling this program a soil-conservation program. It is a crop-limitation program, insofar as the money can be used for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can call it what he pleases. Of course, heretofore, last year, for example, under the program there were marketing quotas on wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice.

Mr. TYDINGS. And corn.

Mr. RUSSELL. There were no marketing quotas on corn, and there never have been.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean production quotas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; production quotas; but they represented goals. There was no restriction on the planting by the individual farmer; he could plant all the corn he wished to plant.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if he did, could he receive the soil-conservation payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, if he planted a certain number of acres in cover crops and leguminous crops, and so forth. As to cotton, the quotas on cotton have not been lifted. There has been considerable discussion as to whether they should be lifted. They have been increased by 10 percent.

If a farmer who has a basic allotment of cotton does not plant that acreage to cotton, to enable that farmer to receive one of these payments out of the soil-conservation funds, it is necessary that he either plant the land which is not planted in cotton to the production of a leguminous or cover crop approved by the A. A. A. and plow that crop under, or that he plant the land to one of the essential food crops needed this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. If he plants it to an essential food crop, that is not soil conservation and soil-building practice, because in raising an essential food crop he takes substance out of the soil and does not put it back. I think it is only fair to say that a large part of this program was used to cut down the acreage of cotton as a national policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only cotton, but wheat.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was not used primarily as a soil-building and conservation measure. I do not believe it is fair to confuse the two appropriations, one of which attempts to limit production of certain commodities on the farm, and then call that a soil-conservation program, because the land taken out of one crop is often put into another crop which is just as injurious to the soil as was the previous crop.

Mr. RUSSELL. It may not be fair to call it a soil-conservation appropriation, but all these payments have been embraced under this head, which is the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ever since that statute was enacted by the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. What does the Senator mean by "domestic allotment"?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the allotment program to which the Senator refers. Payments have been made for those practices for the past 6 years. There is

no difference in the character of the payments which are made to cotton producers this year, as compared with those which have been made for the past 6 years. The difference in the case of the wheat producer is that the restrictions on the marketing of his wheat have been entirely removed this year, whereas he was under restrictions last year.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be true; but I still maintain that with an appropriation of \$300,000,000 there is ample money for the soil-conservation program, and that during the war the Congress ought to discontinue the limitations on production which we used to cut down surpluses. That was the purpose of them. That was why we appropriated the money. There was a tremendous surplus of some commodities on the agricultural market. A great many of those surpluses are being whittled down. Some have disappeared; but under the guise of soil conservation we are continuing a program devised primarily to cut down surpluses, when it is not soil conservation at all. In my humble judgment, if we appropriate \$300,000,000 there will be sufficient money available to carry out the soil-conservation program in accordance with the commitments made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we are referring to the funds expended by farmers by soil-conservation practices, \$197,000,000 would cover that. That has nothing to do with this question. For 6 years we have carried on this program under the same act, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. No question has been raised heretofore about any division of funds. It is all on the same work sheet which the farmer signs, which is similar to those which he has signed in years gone by.

The Senator has referred to cotton. I am always a bit hesitant about discussing cotton on the floor of the Senate, because naturally I have a basic interest in cotton as a commodity produced in my State. However, I wish to say, in all fairness to the cotton producers who receive these almost infinitesimal payments, that if the Senator from Maryland or anyone else had to buy seed out of his own pocket and sow his land with leguminous crops, and then turn those crops under before he could receive the little payment, which in many cases amounts to not more than three or four dollars, he would feel that he had earned it, and that there was no absolute grant or gift for taking the land out of cultivation, because he must devote the land which he takes out of cotton production either to a soil-building crop or, this year, to such crops as peanuts. We have a shortage of approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of vegetable oils.

It does not make any difference whether the crop be cotton, corn, tobacco, wheat, or rice, or whether the farmer be a grain farmer or a dairy farmer. It is not fair to him to change the rules after the game starts, and after the program was announced in December. It is not fair for us to say, when the

time comes to make the appropriation, that we are going to change the rules because Congress has changed its mind as to what is a soil-conserving practice.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be a great mistake for the Senate to alter this important agricultural program in the midst of war. This Nation has been most profligate in the development of its natural resources. We have sacrificed our timber, until in more recent times when we have made an effort, by the expenditure of huge sums of money, to check the sacrifice of our timber resources by bringing about more scientific methods of cutting the timber. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in reforestation.

The loss of our timber assets was more spectacular than the loss of our soil resources; but it does not require an expert to travel through the areas of this country which have been longest under cultivation, to see that the apprehensions which Thomas Jefferson felt when he saw how the soil was being wasted and eroded have come to pass.

It is estimated that we are losing annually 3,000,000,000 tons of topsoil in this country through erosion. In short, we have been mining our soil resources; and the older areas of cultivation in this country all bear visible testimony to the fact that we have been mining the soil.

Mr. President, some effort has been made in the past few minutes to indicate that this program is devoted in part to the purpose of curtailing production. That is true only in a limited sense. How could we ever get any soil conservation and rebuilding of the assets which have been mined out of the soil unless we diverted some of the acreage which has been planted for generations in cotton to some type of crop which would restore nitrogen and fertility to the soil?

If Senators have been in certain areas of the South, they have seen entire counties eroded beyond any hope of redemption. If they have traveled through New England, they have seen the result of the resettlement programs of the past. In New England the soil was mined, and today farms are abandoned.

We solved our resettlement problems in the past because we had a vast public domain, and once farms became infertile as a result of erroneous and profligate practices in their cultivation, the oncoming generation of younger men and women could move back, take new soil, and repeat the process. It has been only within recent years that we have come to understand that unless we conserve our soil resources, unless we restore the fertility of the millions of acres from which it has been taken, the ultimate fate of civilization in this country will be the same as that of civilizations of the past which have gone down because they have not conserved their soil. The cradle of civilization is now a virtual desert. Go to China, or read about China; study the history of China, and

see what has happened to the millions of Chinese as the result of the wastage of their soil resources.

Mr. President, insofar as the curtailment of the acreage of cotton is concerned, I believe it is a tragedy that it has not been further reduced and some effort made to convert those acres to the production of food which the people of this Nation will need vitally before this war is over. As a matter of fact, I fear that the people will go hungry in this country next winter, not because they do not have money with which to buy food, but because the money which they possess, and the rationing coupons which they have in their books, will not permit them to secure the delivery of the food which they require.

The farmer has been a much-abused member of society ever since this war began. It has been "open season" on the farmer. I think it is high time that we reverse that policy and realize that unless we have adequate food and fiber essential to the war effort, the prodigious strides which we have made in the production of war materials may turn out to have been a futile endeavor; for I say that in total war we not only have to maintain the dietary standards of those in the armed services, but we have to maintain the dietary standards and furnish the food to the people who are supplying the materials for the fighting forces to use against our enemies.

What has been the attitude and policy of the Government, Mr. President? It has been to turn to industry and say, "Produce the goods—we care not what the cost. We will provide you with a contract providing for a return on your managerial contribution, but your costs may be whatever shall be necessary."

The slogan "Produce the goods regardless of cost" has been, figuratively speaking, the policy of Government insofar as industry has been concerned. But, so far as the farmer is concerned, Mr. President, he has been turned upon in this situation if he asked for a price which would represent his cost of production and his labor. He has been denounced as an individual seeking to enrich himself at the expense of the rest of society in this war effort.

I believe a very unfortunate psychological effect was produced in the farming communities of this country as a result of the address made by the President of the United States on last Labor Day. I do not think the farm communities have yet recovered from that psychological situation. However, I know of nothing which would contribute more to the demoralization of the farmers at this time than to have Congress now turn its back upon an obligation which the farmers entered into in good faith and which they now expect the Government to discharge.

Yesterday afternoon the Senate passed a huge appropriation bill providing \$24,500,000,000 for the Navy in an hour and 20 minutes. No one strained at that camel. It went through the eye of the Senate without any difficulty. But, what would have been the effect upon the con-



tractors who heretofore had entered into contractual relations with the Government and had not yet been paid if a proviso had been added stating that no contractor was to receive any money out of this appropriation in excess of 75 cents on each dollar the Government owed him? Does any Senator believe that would have had a good effect upon the morale of industry and labor? That, Mr. President, in essence is what is being proposed now. The farmers of this country had every right to assume in good faith that the Government of the United States and the Congress would provide the farmer with the necessary means to carry out the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing law, and for which the Congress over a period of not less than 6 years had never failed to provide.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator from Wisconsin believe that an appropriation of \$300,000,000 will not fully take care of the undertakings made to the farmer?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly do. I am advised that \$400,000,000 is the minimum amount which can be appropriated by the Congress to carry out the program which was announced by the Secretary of Agriculture and which the farmers of the country participating in the program have translated into individual work sheets for every acre of the farm they own.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Have those obligations been incurred?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think they have been incurred. I think that when the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under a law which was passed by Congress 6 years ago, stated that he had the power to make obligations and announced a program to the farmers, and the farmers in turn translated that program into work sheets covering the acreage of the farms which they owned, I think a moral obligation was assumed, and I think that the Congress of the United States has a moral obligation to carry it out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. My question to the Senator is: Has the program gone so far in being carried out that the \$300,000,000 will not cover it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion it has. In practically every section of the country I know anything about, although the season is tragically late, dangerously late, I may say ominously late, most of the farmers have already planted their crops, or are preparing to do so, and have purchased their seed and made all their arrangements for obtaining fertilizer, in those instances where they could obtain it, and they have planned their entire program for this year. If the Senator can show me a farmer in the United States of America who has not made his plans for the 1943 season, I will say that such farmer does not know anything about his business.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What about the item of purchase of law books, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers? Does the Senator believe that obligation is one which has been carried through to the point that we shall have to increase this appropriation by \$100,000,000?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is a provision in this item for administrative expenses. The Senator well knows that no program can be administered unless there is money spent for administering it. The program under the House bill would amount to \$300,000,000.

Under the program as laid down by the Secretary of Agriculture it would amount to \$400,000,000. Certainly no man can be so naive as to assume that sum of money could be handled and a very substantial portion of it paid out to individual farmers in the United States of America in the form of checks drawn after they had fulfilled obligations worked out on their worksheets, and checked, without the expenditure of some money for the administration of the program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the remarks concerning soil conservation. The people of Nebraska are interested in that subject just as much as those who live in the Southern and New England States. We want to do all we can to produce and preserve more food. I should like to propound a question. Does the Senator believe that the provision in question which runs through the Triple A has in reality resulted in the increased production of food?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion, it has accomplished greatly in the increased fertility of the soil and in checking the erosion of the soil. I could take the Senator into my own State, which was one of the 43 States—indeed I think Wisconsin was one of the first States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a soil-conservation system—and travel with him over miles and miles of highway, if I could get the gasoline for the purpose, and show him the most amazing evidences of the value of the soil-conservation program. The State of Wisconsin is usually thought of as a State not subject to much soil erosion, because it is a great dairy State; but even in that great dairy State, Mr. President, the soil-conservation program has accomplished wonders in checking the erosion of soil and in bringing about renewed and increased fertility of soil which had already been eroded.

I have traveled, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, in the South, where I have seen the marvelous work which has been accomplished there in an area where erosion of the soil was much further advanced because of its long-time devotion to the cultivation of two principal soil-depleting crops, namely, cotton and tobacco.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Aside from conservation and production, which the Senator says have been increased—and I am in-

clined to agree with him—during the past half dozen years we have had in force a restricted agricultural policy; we have paid millions upon millions of dollars to farmers to take land out of production. Now we are confronted with a food situation referred to by the Senator, which will result, I think, in starvation in many places in this country before another year has passed. Yet during all these years, right up to February, this administration has adopted a policy of economic scarcity, and has paid the farmers millions of dollars to take land out of production, when it should have been paying them to produce the foods which are so badly needed. I should like to know if the \$300,000,000 appropriation will increase the food supply. Is the farmer going to be allowed to produce all the food he can produce on his land? That is what I should like to have the Senator answer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me respond to the Senator from Nebraska and then I shall yield.

In the first place, I will say to the Senator—and I have previously discussed this matter with him—that I supported the Triple A program in this body because I saw no other alternative to meet the problem confronting the farmer during the years of depression when the buying power of the people of this country was at a low ebb and there were great crop surpluses. I personally was committed originally to the so-called McNary-Haugen program, and it has always been my belief that if the two Republican Presidents who vetoed that measure had seen fit to let it become law we might have avoided much of the difficulty and not have fallen so deep into the depression which we experienced.

I may say further that in the program of growing more food, more agricultural products, the Senator must bear in mind that some of these commodities are not edible—cotton, for example. To my mind, as I stated a moment ago, more cotton acreage should have been curtailed this year than was curtailed. I think that every possible resource of Government should have been properly utilized to produce more foodstuffs upon some of the acreage now devoted to the production of fibers. I know that there are certain vested interests which find it difficult to make such a conversion, but I make the prediction, Mr. President, that by the time the 1st of next January rolls around we will bitterly regret that there was not further curtailment of cotton production and a greater production of foodstuffs which would be available to the people of this country and to the fighting forces.

Therefore, I cannot answer the Senator by saying that it was a mistake to curtail all commodities. In trying to mobilize the Nation for production of food for war, Mr. President, a most careful plan has to be laid down in order to provide the commodities necessary to feed our armed forces, to meet our lend-lease commitments, and to feed the civilian population of the United States.

I think that when next winter rolls around we will be criticized because there was not more and better planning, because there were not more and better devices utilized to stimulate production of the commodities which we so vitally need. I say that we are not moving in the direction of stimulating the farmers who are already laboring under all the handicaps any producer could suffer.

Do you realize, Mr. President, that the farmers are short of labor? Do you realize that they are short of machinery? Do you realize that they are short of the ordinary supplies the farmer must have from day to day, from week to week and from month to month? Do you realize that they have to go through enough red tape and paper forms to discourage a Philadelphia lawyer in order to get the essentials to their production?

Do we want now, Mr. President, on top of all the difficulties and all the trouble the farmer has experienced, and all the abuse he has received, to turn our backs on an obligation entered into so far as the farmer was concerned last December and pay him only 75 cents of what the Congress stated he would be paid? If any Senator wants to take that position, Mr. President, I want it to be taken on the record, so that I can read it next winter when people are hungry.

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that soil conservation has been a neglected subject in this country, and one that we should pursue both in peace and in war, but I will point out, if the Senator will bear with me, that I think he has been tilting at a windmill when he calls this program a soil-conservation program. As the best evidence is always the law itself, let me read from the law to illustrate my point that a great deal of this program has nothing to do with soil conservation at all. It was a crop limitation program, in part, to get rid of the surpluses which were cluttering up the American agricultural market and had not a single, solitary ounce of soil conservation in it from A to Z. For example, I hold the act in my hand—

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the act to which the Senator refers?

Mr. TYDINGS. A compilation of soil-conservation and domestic allotment acts brought up to January 2, 1942.

The funds available for payment shall be allotted among the commodities produced with respect to which payments or grants are to be computed.

What were they? They were wheat, cotton, corn, and two or three other commodities. They were to be paid upon their acreage production.

I have informed myself as to how much of this appropriation would go for soil conservation and how much would go for acreage curtailment of one kind or another. The over-all figure is only half of it, so \$200,000,000 would be utilized in the field of soil conservation, and the remainder would be used under the

domestic-allotment plan, which is a plan to cut down surpluses.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does that mean that the remainder of the fund will be used to keep acres idle and not productive?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I would not want to say that, but it means that as to certain crops, taking prior years as a yardstick, if a farmer raised more than a certain amount of the designated crops, he would get no payment from the Federal Government. If he raised so much or less, he would get a payment. Again putting on the stand the best evidence, which is the law itself, let me read that section so that there will be no dispute about it. How are these allotment plans fixed for the designated crops?

1. The average acreage planted to the various commodities for the 10 years, 1928 to 1937, adjusted for abnormal weather and other conditions, including acreage diverted from production under the agricultural adjustment and soil-conservation program.

That is one of the measures.

2. The value of the parity prices of the production for the allotted acres of the various commodities for the year with respect to which the payment is made.

The value of the thing determines it. If wheat is selling at a high price, the farmer gets less. The Government wants him to produce more. If it is selling at a low price, it wants him to raise less of it. So that there is not any conservation in this.

I agree thoroughly with the conservation observations made by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am not taking issue in those matters. I say it is continuing in the bill, the philosophy of scarcity, and no one can successfully deny it, because I have read the yardstick, and that is the law under which the Secretary of Agriculture must administer the program.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that there is a shortage of food; I agree with the Senator that we should produce more food if possible; but this does not assure that more food will be produced, does it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, I think it does.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Because, in the first place, it would not be at all possible to get farmers to stop producing in part a crop, such as cotton, for example, unless there were some way of offering them an inducement.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator's own argument, if I understood it rightly, was that they would take land out of cotton and put it into soil-building crops, which are not food.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes; some of the soil-building crops do produce food. Soybeans, for example, are soil-building food.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And we are greatly in need of edible fats.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The people of this country are going to be very short of edible fats, which are essential for the maintenance of human energy.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with that statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We cannot expect to convert crops which are not useful to the war effort, or crops which are depleting the soil of the country, unless it is made possible to offer some inducement to the farmers to make such conversion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Offering an inducement to switch over from producing one kind of a crop to another and call it soil conservation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But it is soil conservation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment, if the Senator will allow me to prove that it is not soil conservation.

First of all, outside one or two crops which put nitrogen into the soil—and the accepted mode of soil conservation is for green fertilizer to be applied to crops, clover, and so forth, as well as commercial fertilizer—the farmers of the South are being asked to raise potatoes and other foods which are not soil-conservation crops. Producing potatoes takes substance out of the soil. So that in the main, while there may be a case here and there in which the change does produce the planting of a soil-conservation crop, such as soybeans, or other forms of nitrogen-building legumes, in the main under this program the farmers simply go from one crop to another crop which utilizes the fertility of the soil, which is not soil conservation at all, and the language of the law proves it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My complaint is that there has not been more acreage diverted from cotton. It is my understanding, and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, that in the South this year the emphasis has been laid upon the crops which produce things necessary to the war effort, but which at the same time are soil-conservation crops.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is Roman riding, he is on two horses. They are essential to the war effort.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but they help build the soil.

Mr. TYDINGS. They do not. When a farmer plants corn, when he plants potatoes, when he plants things of that character, they do not help build the soil, they take substance out of the soil.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the edible fats do help build up the soil. The Senator is not familiar with the facts if he does not know that there is a prodigious program now going on in this country for increased production of edible oils and fats.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course I know that.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.



Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest that the greatest of the oil-producing crops is peanuts, and that peanuts exhaust the soil possibly as much as any crop which is raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Take cotton itself, which produces one of the finest oils and cattle feeds of which one can conceive. Cottonseed meal and oil are not only essential for farmers generally, outside the cotton areas, but they are utilized in the production of any number of munitions which are vital to the war. There are all kinds of what I think are called lintels, which come off the seed which are used in one of the operations in the production of explosives, and are in tremendous demand by the War Department today, far beyond the ability of the farmers of this country to produce.

Returning to the matter which is at issue in connection with the bill, it is a fallacy, it is pure sophistry, to call this a soil-conservation program, when the definition of the law itself, which binds the Secretary of Agriculture, provides for the limitation of certain crops, of which, as every Senator knows, there was a surplus which had so far depressed the market for those crops—cotton and wheat and corn at one time—that the farmer could not sell them and recover the cost of production.

Mr. President, the day of that condition is past; it is fading into twilight and into night. We are in a period now when we need to conserve our soil, it is true, and we shall support appropriations designed for that purpose, but we are also in a period when, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, we need food, and the program we are discussing is nothing more nor less than an indirect way, if it is properly followed, of producing foods, switching from one crop to another, and it is not a soil-building and conservation program in all its ramifications.

I wish to apologize to the Senator from Ohio, because he rose twice and I promised to yield to him, but in the heat of the debate I forgot to do so. I am willing to yield at any time.

Mr. TAFT. I only desire to call attention to the testimony before the committee, which apparently supports the Senator's viewpoint. I refer to the testimony of Mr. O'Neal, the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears on page 725 of the hearings. He said:

It is our conviction that additional Treasury funds are not needed to assume maximum productions in 1943. On the contrary, substantial reductions in last year's figures for some appropriation items can be made, and we believe such reductions will be helpful in the war effort.

In line with these principles, we therefore recommend that this committee—

Approve House provisions continuing Agricultural Adjustment Administration and limiting appropriations to \$300,000,000 solely for soil-building and water-conservation practice payments and administrative expenses.

I take it that the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is making exactly the same distinction the Senator is making.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct, and not only that, but I understand the Grange took the same position.

Mr. TAFT. Soil-building and water-conservation practice payments are those which are made directly for conservation purposes. But apparently it is desired to eliminate entirely the other class of payments, which in fact are restrictive payments.

I wish to make one other observation on that matter. It seems to me that if the American Farm Bureau Federation, probably having more farmers in its membership than any other organization in the country, says the appropriation should be reduced to \$300,000, they cannot be thinking we are violating any promise made to any farmer who is a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator's logic is unassailable. I cannot speak for the farmers of America, because my acquaintance with them, as every other Senator's must be, is limited, but I have read in numerous newspapers and certain farm magazines, and through their own accredited representatives I have heard, that they think the time has come when this part of the old program should be reviewed and eliminated wherever it can be done without injuring the war effort.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, who rose first, and then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator from Maryland and also to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have been very much impressed by the argument with respect to raising more food crops. That is very essential to the United States in time of war. But I may also point out that as recently as November of last year the Secretary of Agriculture in the Wickard case, pressed before the courts, placed a penalty upon an Indiana farmer for raising too much wheat in time of war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator took the words out of my mouth.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To me it is an abominable circumstance that in this country in time of war, when we need the food, when we acknowledge that we need it, when we know that we need it, the Secretary of Agriculture is vested with the power of placing a penalty upon a farmer for raising a needed crop such as wheat.

Mr. TYDINGS. A farmer living in Carroll County, a neighboring county to mine, a law-abiding man who tries to farm well and does farm well, but who was not conversant with the law, was confronted when he was ready to sell his wheat with a penalty of over \$500. He wrote to me about the matter, and I felt somewhat humiliated and ashamed to tell him that I had at least indirectly and somewhat unwittingly been a party to that sort of transaction.

Before I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, let me read four lines at the end—I will not read the intermediate

part—of the act to prove what the Senator from Wisconsin has so clearly stated:

*Provided, That farm average allotments shall be made for wheat in 1938, but in determining compliance wheat shall be considered in the group with other crops for which special acreage allotments are not made.*

Mr. President, why bring wheat in merely for the year 1938? If this is a soil-building and a conservation program, why not leave wheat in for all time? The truth of the matter is, however, as every Senator knows, that in that year it was supposed that there would be a carry-over and a surplus together which would depress the price of wheat; so this program was used to curtail the production of wheat, not for soil-conservation purposes, but so that the price of wheat perhaps would rise to such a point that the farmer could receive a fair price for it. That is all right, but let us call it by its true name. Let us not call it soil conservation, and let us not have it now if we do not need it now. The truth is we now need all the food of every kind we can get.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the carrying out of the act as originally passed resulted in the benefits with respect to soil conservation which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has mentioned, but if we continue to invoke it for the purpose for which it was created, to place limitations on crops, would not that tend to increase the price all the way along the line?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the deduction might be drawn in line with the Senator's statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Further, what we want to do is produce all the food we can. Is that not true?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In my State, we really grow corn. I am not familiar with cotton, but I know something about corn, and I know something about wheat. I know that up to February of this year, if a farmer planted only a wheat crop, and did not in furtherance of the war effort plant some other crops with which we are not familiar in Nebraska, he was penalized on his wheat crop. I went to the office of the Secretary of Agriculture and had a talk with him. I am sure he told me that there were no restrictions now on anything we wanted to grow. If that is true, and I think it ought to be true because the Secretary is well informed, is there any limitation in this act? For what, if anything, are we paying this money aside from soil conservation?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not compulsory, but there is a limitation, because the Secretary of Agriculture can promulgate regulations providing that if a farmer plants more than a certain portion of his farm to a given crop he shall not receive any benefit.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, that is the interpretation I place on the language, and therefore, there is still a restriction or limitation on planting wheat and corn.

Mr. TYDINGS. At least indirectly it is implied in the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. It is implied in the law. I wish to say that I stated in February that what we need is food, and that we should remove the restrictions with respect to these crops, and if we were to pay the farmer anything we should pay him to produce, and not pay him for not producing essentials we shall need.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I had not intended to rise again, but I did so because I felt that the Senator from Wisconsin had misinterpreted my position, which was not in opposition to soil conservation, but to the utilization of so-called soil-conservation funds for the purpose of limiting agricultural production quite apart from soil-conservation practices.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Reference was made a short while ago to the American Farm Bureau Federation. The American Farm Bureau Federation is on record as supporting the House amount of \$300,000,000. I simply wish to say a word with respect to the American Farm Bureau Federation. I have not always agreed with it, but it is the greatest farm organization in America. Fortune Magazine recently took a poll to determine which of the farm organizations had the largest membership. Of all organized farmers the American Farm Bureau Federation had 60 percent. Of the high-income farmers the Federation had 60 percent. Of all the medium-income farmers who were organized the Federation had 61 percent. Of the low-income farmers the Federation had 48 percent. The next highest organization was the Grange, which agrees with the Federation in this instance.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to know when the Grange agreed to it. I listened very closely to the hearings and no such statement was made.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true. Mr. O'Neal spoke for both the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation, but the Senator will recall that Mr. Goss was there that day—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Goss of the Grange?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and some others; I do not know how many, but I think they took the position that Mr. O'Neal had stated the case, and they did not identify themselves.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Goss appeared before the committee in his own right.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I withdraw the statement. The Senator may be correct. I do not wish to take advantage by stating something, no matter how sincerely I am doing it, which may not be accurate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that it is inconceivable to me that the American Farm Bureau Federation would advocate something which is charged to be a breach of faith with the farmers of the country. I can-

not conceive that to be true, because the American Farm Bureau Federation is directly responsible to the 60 percent of the organized farmers who constitute the membership of that organization. The federation held local meetings. What was decided at those meetings was carried up to State conventions, and the judgment expressed by Mr. O'Neal in Washington is the judgment which comes from the grass roots all over the country. So I must take issue with Senators who contend that we are breaking faith with the farmers, simply because we propose to reduce the appropriation from \$400,000,000 to \$300,000,000. I think the Senator from Maryland will agree with me when I say that no official of this Government has the right to bind Congress as to any specific appropriation in future years.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator, and I shall conclude with three or four brief observations. The first is that the trouble with the farmer does not lie in whether this measure shall be passed. It lies in the great imponderables which always arise in time of war or when war is imminent—shortage of labor, shortage of fertilizer, shortage of machinery, shortage of transportation, the concomitants of war on a total scale. That is the farmer's trouble, and we cannot legislate for those things back on the farm by the appropriation of money.

The second thing is that prices and wages have been bound up into one general formula by the passage of the O. P. A. Act, the War Stabilization Act, and so forth. It is not good government now indirectly to pay a subsidy to any group working for the war effort any more than it would be fair to pay from the Federal Treasury a subsidy to coal miners or shipyard workers or automobile workers or any other group. If we adopt such a policy, quite apart from the national problem of soil conservation, we might find that it will establish a precedent, and the precedent may be used sooner or later, if the war continues sufficiently long, by the workers to ask for equality of treatment and to request that they also be allowed a subsidy, particularly those groups that perhaps have a better case than some of the more highly paid groups now have.

Finally, I am for the soil-conservation program, as I believe the Congress is as a unit, and as I believe the country is as a unit; but I think we have outlived the policy—certainly during the war—of the philosophy of scarcity. I think we have reached the time when, if we want crops of a certain kind produced, we should adopt some other methods than one which was created to relieve the depression, if we tell the truth, because it is the Siamese twin of the old, original Agricultural Adjustment Act, which was knocked out by the Supreme Court and was revamped to fit the Court's objections insofar as they could be met.

So, Mr. President, in my humble judgment, if the appropriation is reduced to \$300,000,000, first, no considerable group of farmers in the country will object; second, an economy, and a deserved economy, of \$100,000,000 will be effected; third, the entire soil-conservation pro-

gram will not be hurt one iota; and, fourth, an inequality created to help a particular group in a period of depression, the depression since having disappeared, will have been eliminated, as it should be eliminated, as we approach more normal times and more normal prices in the field of agriculture, and particularly as to the crops for which the plan was created.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to say a word in conclusion. I cannot agree with the Senator from Maryland or other Senators who take the position that we can obtain soil conservation and a rebuilding of our soil without having a diversion for the one-crop areas. All that the Senator from Maryland or any other Senator has to do is to travel by train—he does not even have to travel by automobile—through the cotton areas of the South, to see the effect on the soil of producing only one crop for generation after generation.

We can obtain a diversion, a change in the practices of the farmers, in only two ways: First, by offering the farmers an inducement, which this program attempts to do; and, second, by compulsion, which, in my opinion, would be unconstitutional. I say that any man is blind, indeed, who cannot now go through the South or through any other agricultural area of the country and see what has been accomplished by the appropriation of this money. We could not have gotten the cotton farmers, the corn farmers, the wheat farmers, or the tobacco farmers—the one-crop producers—to adopt any soil-conservation practices unless we had offered them an inducement to do so. That meant a curtailment of the acreage planted to the soil-depleting crops which they had normally and historically produced. If we had not changed that historical basis, we should not have accomplished anything in the way of bringing about soil conservation in the one-crop producing areas of the United States.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me it is to fail to understand the whole theory upon which the program was based, to think that we can divorce soil conservation from the curtailment of acreage planted to crops which are soil-depleting in character. On each farm, on each plantation, there must be made and carried out year after year a program of changing the historical and past practices of the farm owner or plantation owner, and inducing him to curtail the production of certain soil-depleting crops, and to put the acreage into the production of soil-building and soil-conserving crops.

I say that this program has bearing, both direct and indirect, upon food production. I say furthermore that if we go back on the program which was laid down, the farmers of the country will have a right to believe that we have repudiated a moral obligation which they thought we had authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into on our behalf with them; and they will feel that we have repudiated that moral obligation and have agreed to pay them only 75 cents on the dollar of the obligation which our agent incurred.



#### CONFIRMATION OF COAST GUARD GRADUATES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of Coast Guard cadets who will graduate tomorrow at 11 o'clock, and it is desired that they shall receive their commissions at the time of the graduation, which is the regular order. Therefore I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that I may report the list sent down by the President of the nomination of cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 9th day of June, and I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nominations at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc, and confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the debate on the pending amendment has probably covered most of the questions which might arise; but I think certain things which have been said should be clarified. References have been made, particularly by the Senator from Maryland, to the Domestic Allotment Act, in his effort to show that not all these payments are strictly soil-conservation payments. I am ready to agree that not all the payments are made directly for what might be termed soil-conserving practices. But the two programs—that under the Domestic Allotment Act by which we sought to provide what was referred to as the "ever-normal granary" and the soil conservation program—have gone hand in hand in this program, and it is impossible to perform a feat of surgery and to separate one from the other. They are both integral and component parts of the same general program.

Much of the debate which has taken place on this problem would seem to me to be rather far from the question. The point was that the Secretary of Agriculture had undertaken to penalize a wheat farmer who had produced more than his allotment under the program last year. Last year was the only year the wheat farmers have been under marketing quotas. I merely desire to point out that in attempting to enforce that law the Secretary of Agriculture was conforming to the dictates of the Congress. On the question of whether the statute is a good one or a bad one, the responsibility rests upon the Congress of the United States, not upon any individual; because the Secretary of Agri-

culture was directed by law to enforce that act of Congress.

Mr. President, I should like to point out further that none of the marketing quotas is ever placed in effect upon any commodity until it has been approved by the vote of two-thirds of the producers of the commodity, at elections duly held and supervised by farmers. Under the law passed by Congress, no quotas can be imposed, no farmer can be prosecuted, no limitation can be made in the acreage, unless two-thirds of the producers of the commodity so determine at the polls, in an election duly called in each agricultural county for that purpose. As a matter of fact, at the present time there is no limitation whatever upon the production of corn, there is no limitation whatever upon the production of wheat, there is no limitation whatever upon the production of rice—the three products which are regarded as the basic commodities at the present time. On the contrary, the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture this year, that to which the farmers have responded, and as a result of which I contend that the appropriation should be made in full, was not designed to restrict or curtail production; but, by the express terms of the Secretary's announcement, it was designed to increase the production of the foods of which there is such a shortage in this country today as to cause some persons to be apprehensive lest we shall have a famine.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a press release of the Department of Agriculture, issued on December 5, 1942, promulgating the program of the Department for the current year. It is the program upon which 6,000,000 farmers have already acted, and as to which an appropriation of \$400,000,000 will be required in order to fulfill the obligations of the Government. I read the announcement:

#### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ANNOUNCES THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY'S 1943 ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT RATES

Rates of payment to farmers cooperating with the crop-production adjustment phase of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's 1943 war program were announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Farmers may earn these production adjustment payments in 1943 by complying with their Agricultural Adjustment Agency's acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, at the same time meeting individual farm-production goals for special war crops. Following out the Department's policy of full production of all crops needed in the war, severe deductions will be made from each farm's total crop payments in 1943 for failure to plant at least 90 percent of an acreage allotment and 90 percent of a special war-crop goal.

There are no restrictions in this announcement. There is the requirement that the goal for the production of war crops shall be met before the payments shall be made. I continue to read:

This provision is intended to encourage farmers to make full use of their available land. In many instances, farmers will be encouraged to substitute special war crops for allotment crops, especially for wheat and cotton. After farmers first meet their 90 percent special war-crop acreage require-

ment, they may take any special war-crop acreage above this figure and substitute it acre for acre for allotment crops in meeting the latter's 90-percent planting provision.

In other words, unless 90 percent of the allotment were planted to the crops needed in the war effort, payments to the farmer would be reduced.

In addition to the crop-production adjustment payment described above, farmers also will be able to earn a production practice—or conservation—payment by carrying out specified agricultural practices which improve soil, help prevent erosion, and increase yields of needed war crops. Since these conservation rates vary by regions and States, they are being announced by State Agricultural Adjustment Agency committees.

Mr. President, how in the world is it possible for any Senator to segregate the payments which are made for soil-conservation practices from those which are made for the production of war crops? Today there are no payments conditioned upon the reduction of acreage for any food product. The only payments which are made which are conditioned upon reduction of acreage are those made to producers of cotton and tobacco, and under this program they may plant up to 90 percent of their allotment, either in cotton or tobacco, or in a war food crop; and they must plant the war food crop acreage required of them before they are entitled to payment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the South, for example, or in the great burley tobacco-producing areas, how in the world could a single acre in those areas ever be utilized for the production of things needed for food in time of war except by getting the farmers not to plant as many acres of cotton or tobacco as they planted last year, and persuading them to plant the crops we need?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have been impossible to produce such crops without guaranteeing the price from some other source or instituting a program of this kind under the Domestic Allotment and Adjustment Act.

We have for the moment the controversy as to whether or not the Secretary is legally authorized to make these commitments to the farmers. I wish to discuss this question for a moment from the standpoint of good morals and ethics, and what the Congress should do in this situation.

Whether the Secretary has the legal right to make these commitments or not, they have been made year after year for the past 6 years; and the announcement which he has made has been the yardstick followed by Congress in making appropriations to meet these obligations. For 6 years farmers have gone into their county A. A. offices, and worked out their program. They have computed the payments which they would receive in December, and the Congress has made the appropriations and the payments have been made.

This year it is proposed to say to the farmer, "You have done your work; Congress has supported the operations of

the Secretary of Agriculture for 6 years; but now we are going to refuse to do so. We are going to pay you with 75-cent dollars."

Whether it is legal, or whether we are quibbling over technicalities or not, I say it would be a breach of good faith and morals for Congress to deny payments to the farmers, who in many instances have gone down into their own pockets and expended their own funds for seed and for conservation practices which were required of them in order to earn these payments.

There is no way on earth to divide this program and say, "This is soil conservation, and that is domestic allotment." If this law is wrong, the Congress ought to change it. If the Secretary has not the right, or should not have the right, to incur obligations for payments under these acts, the Congress should so declare by legislation. However, after the crop has been fixed and the farmer has spent his money in following out the program and checking with his county office as to what he is to receive, after he has already incurred expenditures and put forth his labor and sweat in the fields to conform to the practices, we should not say, "We are not going to make the payments because, forsooth, some of this money has been spent for something that was not a soil-conservation practice."

It would be unfair, unjust, and immoral to take this money away from the farmers, wherever they may be, whether or not the program measures up to what Senators may think is a strictly soil-conservation program. If we wish to adjust this matter we should do it for next year. We should not, after the farmer has acted in good faith, attempt to reduce the appropriation and deny him the payments which he has honestly earned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 68, line 2, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 2, after the word "newspapers", it is proposed to strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	McClellan
Austin	Eastland	McFarland
Bailey	Ellender	McKellar
Bankhead	George	McNary
Barbour	Cerry	Maloney
Elibo	Gillette	Maybank
Eone	Green	Mead
Buck	Guffey	Millikin
Burton	Gurney	Moore
Bushfield	Hatch	Murray
Byrd	Hayden	Nye
Capper	Hill	O'Daniel
Caraway	Holman	O'Mahoney
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Chavez	La Follette	Revercomb
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lodge	Scrugham
Danaher	McCarran	Shipstead

Smith	Tunnell	Wheeler
Stewart	Tydings	Wherry
Taft	Vandenberg	White
Thomas, Okla.	Van Nuys	Willis
Tobey	Walsh	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 68, line 2.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Am I correct in understanding that to vote "yea" is to vote for an increase to \$400,000,000, and that to vote "nay" is to vote in favor of maintaining the amount at \$300,000,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The yeas and nays having already been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. REED's name was called). The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent from the Senate. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in an important committee meeting. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], who, if present would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPER] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained on business in Government departments.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I transfer that pair

to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who if present would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 20, as follows:

## YEAS—49

Aiken	Guffey	Murray
Austin	Gurney	Nye
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Daniel
Elibo	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Eone	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Scrugham
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Smith
Caraway	Langer	Stewart
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McNary	Van Nuys
Ellender	Maloney	Wheeler
George	Maybank	Wilson
Gillette	Mead	
Green	Moore	

## NAYS—20

Bailey	Gerry	Tobey
Barbour	Lodge	Tydings
Buck	McCarran	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Radcliffe	White
Danaher	Revercomb	Willis
Davis	Taft	

## NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Ferguson	Reed
Ball	Gless	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Lucas	Truman
Butler	Murdoch	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Overtton	Wellgren
Downey	Pepper	Wiley

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I was authorized by the committee to offer an amendment which comes properly at this place, and if in order now, I call it up.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 14, after the word "inclusive", it is proposed to insert "Provided, That for the purposes of any law, order, or regulation relating to establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities, the payments made out of funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered as a part of the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities or otherwise taken into account."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the amendment was approved by the committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was.

Mr. McNARY. And the Senator offers it as a committee amendment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, so far as I can. It is legislative in character, but I was authorized by the committee to move to suspend the rule. That, of course, is as far as the committee could go.

Mr. McNARY. At the present time I am not impressed with the amendment. I should like to have a statement by the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to make one.

Mr. McNARY. I reserve the right to make a point of order, which I probably shall do, but I should like to have some information about the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to explain it, and had intended to do so.

Mr. President, a mere reading of this amendment will disclose that it has some of the elements, but not all, of the bill which was passed by the Senate by an almost unanimous vote and was vetoed by the President. The amendment is not intended to raise again, in a direct way, the issues which were presented by the original so-called Bankhead bill and by the President's veto. It is true, however, that the President's Executive order made this amendment necessary, if the order is to be carried out and if a great injustice to the farmer is not thereby committed.

We all recall that the President's Executive order of October 2, which the Senate thought he had no power to make, and so voted, and therefore it did not become a law—and if any Senator cares to see the order I have it here—directed all agencies of the Government in fixing maximum prices to deduct from the parity price, in order to ascertain the maximum price, all parity payments, all soil-conservation payments, and all subsidy payments. Where would that leave the farmers who participated under the soil-conservation program if we completely acquiesced in that doctrine?

There is, of course, as I have indicated, a broad distinction between the original bill which was vetoed and the amendment I have offered, because the bill which was vetoed applied to all kinds of benefit payments; it was not limited to soil conserva-

tion, but included parity and all subsidy payments, and was designed to be a permanent statute, to govern until repealed or otherwise disposed of. This amendment limits the consideration of this subject alone to soil-conservation payments which most Members of the Senate, I think, who have given the subject consideration, have believed all the time were not properly denominated benefit subsidy payments because, in the main, a consideration moved from the farmers, under the invitation of their Government, through compliance with regulations announced by the Department and authorized by the statute, and in carrying out the modes of production which the Secretary had a right to prescribe and which he did from time to time prescribe.

The debate today has brought out that this year the farmers have obligated themselves and paid out of their pockets practically half of this entire appropriation. They have bought leguminous seeds; they have planted them; they have hired the labor, when necessary, and in most cases it was necessary; they have bought equipment here and there, when it was necessary; they have engaged in soil practices in other ways, such as terracing ground at an expensive outlay for labor, and on a schedule which the Secretary, acting under the law as he has done from year to year, prescribed, and the Secretary as well prescribed the rates of pay.

On the other part, farmers have diverted their production from soil-depleting crops. Under the rotation system they have abandoned to some extent the production of regular cash crops and changed to other crops in order to meet the war food-production goals which the Secretary laid down. The rates were prescribed, and I have them here. So, under the program, under the announcement of the Government, as the Senator from Georgia has said, the good faith of the Government was involved.

The law has not changed that program, unless the President's Executive order is the law. Certainly the farmers have not understood that a soil program which requires them to engage in expenditures, labor, and effort has been changed by law or even by Executive order, because they have been encouraged to go along, even since the President's Executive order was made. The notice or declaration to the farmers was issued in December, while the President's order was made on October 2. The Department had led them to believe that it was all right, that it was in line with the usual program and practice to spend their money, their time, and their efforts in this particular soil-building program.

This amendment confines the doctrine laid down to this year's appropriation, as to which, as I see it, the good faith of the Government is involved, for the farmers will be money out of pocket if the President's order is carried out. If there is no intention to carry it out, then who can object to this amendment? Even if the amendment is not needed it should be accepted by unanimous vote, because it would give assurance and confidence to the farmers all over the country on 6,000,-

000 farms who are expecting to receive these payments, which they have worked for and earned.

The President's order to which the amendment is directed provides that these payments must be deducted from the maximum prices, from the market prices, so that if the order is carried out the result will be that the farmer's market price will be reduced below the parity price, if the present market price is at parity, as it is for so many of the more important commodities, but the deduction of these payments in all cases brings down the market price.

I do not believe Congress ever so intended. I do not believe Congress wants to see that result. There is a great commotion all over this country, which is stirring activity in Congress, about a roll-back of the prices of a few commodities, such as meat, and coffee, and butter. Great indignation has been expressed, and protests have been widespread. Although there is not a roll-back of the farmer's price, still there is a fear that that might result.

Here we have a program under the Executive order which constitutes a roll-back of prices, and a roll-back to the farmers, not one affecting processors alone, not one affecting distributors, but a reduction in an amount equivalent to the conservation payments, a reduction in the market price of the farmer, and therefore in the amount of money he gets for his year's work and his crop.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's last statement was that the amount of the soil conservation payments would be taken into consideration in fixing the farmer's price, and his earlier remarks were directed to parity payments. I was wondering whether the Senator had a division showing the amount of money which goes primarily to soil conservation payments and the amount which goes to the domestic allotment plan, because it might be that some Senators would want to differentiate between the domestic allotment plan and the soil conservation plan, where they were separate, and not integrated in the same program.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I must confess that it is somewhat difficult to argue a question such as that with a Baltimore hotel farmer. He talks about the difference between the conservation plan and the domestic allotment plan. I am surprised that the Senator does not know that they are one and the same, and are contained in the same law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a little difficult for me to interpret the Senator's last remark, in view of the fact that he inhabits Mount Everest, and seems to be emulating the Ethiopian in the woodpile. But if I may approach that proposition, of course they are in the same law, but I have not been able yet to find

out where the domestic allotment plan has anything to do directly with soil conservation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is the whole thing; that is what it is.

Mr. TYDINGS. I myself read the law this morning, with those provisions in it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Perhaps it will give the Senator some light for me to say that the domestic allotment plan and the soil conservation plan are the same.

Mr. TYDINGS. While the Senator was absent this morning I read the law to the Senate, so I am conversant with it, and there is a definite distinction between the domestic allotment plan and the soil conservation plan, so recognized in the law itself.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not time to educate the Senator on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. No, and I do not think the Senator would be able to, because one has to start with knowledge before he can impart it to another.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Some people never learn anything and never forget anything.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, as the Senator from Alabama knows, I am 100 percent with him in his position, and I think there is no logical answer to the argument he is making that there should not be considered the conservation payments, which are paid for a specific purpose in compensation for a specific act, in connection with the computation of price. I call the Senator's attention, however, to the language of his proposed amendment:

The payment of funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered as a part of the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities.

In which, of course, we are in full agreement. Then the amendment adds, "or otherwise taken into account."

Mr. BANKHEAD. In fixing maximum prices. It refers back.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am sure the Senator will agree that it leaves that phrase unsupported, where it might be applied to anything else. I suggest, would it not be preferable to add that phrase, if the Senator wants to use it, at the end of line 7, so that it would read that "funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered or otherwise taken into account as a part of the prices," and so forth?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all right. If the Senator thinks it clarifies the language, I have no objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. It would seem to me that it very definitely clarifies it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I had my amendment prepared by the legal draftsman, and I assumed it was correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not assume, of course, to have a keener knowledge of drafting such a measure than the Senator has.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have great respect for the Senator's judgment and complete confidence in his good purpose, and I am inclined to think he is right. I am glad to accept the suggestion.

I shall not take further time of the Senate, unless the minority leader would like to ask me some questions. I have great respect for his judgment. I crave his cooperation.

Unless there is some question, I shall conclude, because I think the Senate understands the proposal, and I shall not take further time now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the very distinguished Senator from Alabama contravenes rule XVI of the Senate. Therefore, I shall make the point of order. Before doing so, let me suggest that I supported this proposal when it was before the Senate on a previous occasion. It passed the Senate and the House, and was vetoed by the President. The veto is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and hearings have been had upon it.

I think it is most unusual, and that it does not conform to any rule of legislation, not to mention the rules of the Senate, that there should be an attempt to write into an appropriation bill a vetoed measure, when the veto message is now pending before a legislative committee.

I am anxious to have the bill passed. It must become a law by June 30. But to place such an amendment in an appropriation bill, which in effect would be to place a veto message in the bill, would necessarily result in causing opposition in the House, it would delay the passage of the measure, so that it probably could not be written into law by the 30th of June. The consideration of the veto message is a matter which is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Secondly, the provision in question does not amount to very much. I remember very well that the able Senator from Alabama, from whose views it grieves me to part, stated in the Senate when he was anxious that his bill, which I supported, be passed, that the benefit it would provide did not at this time amount to very much for the farmers of the country; I think he made an estimate of \$75,000,000. I had a very much lower estimate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. An estimate of \$75,000,000 for what?

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator said if his bill were to pass the farmers of the country would benefit to the extent of \$75,000,000 over their present prices.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I think the Senator will find it was about \$250,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Someone said about \$75,000,000, and I think that estimate was far too high.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I set out the details with respect to it.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator may have, but I probably was not moved favorably by the details.

Mr. President, I make the point of order for the very substantial reason—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order on the ground that the amendment is legislation on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I could not conceive of any more unfortunate amendment than the one which has been proposed by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. It is unfortunate because it is utterly untimely. It would tend, in fact, if adopted, it would actually contribute to and probably make necessary the overthrow of the entire national policy addressed to the gravest domestic crisis which this country has faced in the 18 months since our enemies attacked us. I realize that my statement seems to be sweeping; it may appear at first to be extreme; but I believe I can convince the Senator that it is not extreme and is no more sweeping than the facts justify.

Mr. President, we are in the midst of the gravest internal crisis of the last 8 or 10, perhaps 15 years. We are all familiar, certainly, with the superficial aspects of that crisis. There has been a demand, headed up largely by one man, the president of the United Mine Workers, for an overthrow of the national policy on the subject of wages. He has gone to great lengths. He has even put on a strike against the national defense and in the time of war. He has practically said to the American people, to the American Government, and to its President, and to its Congress that "I, the president of the United Mine Workers, must have my way, whether your country is defeated in battle or not. I must have \$2 a day for my miners."

It had not seemed to me, Mr. President, that that demand created a situation in which the mere matter of \$2 a day was involved. That projected the whole crucial situation of the stabilization of the American economy by means of a firm national policy. It is a test of the power of the Government. It is a test of the stamina and the will of the President. Should Mr. Lewis succeed, we would know then that the Executive order, called the hold-the-line order, had been breached. We would know that the floodgates were open to thousands of demands from all quarters, and we would know that we had let go such power as we now have to maintain the policy of stabilization. We would have an ascending scale of wages. We would have endless demands coming from the wage earners first, and then from the farmers, and coming justly then from the farmers. We have got to hold that line, Mr. President. The terms of this crisis are not the terms merely of meeting Mr. Lewis. The terms of this crisis are the terms of meeting the necessities of national stabilization, and of maintaining the national policy as declared by the President and with the authority of the Congress. We cannot afford to breach it.

Precisely now comes a demand, not unlike the demand from the labor side of the economy, not only that we shall enact legislation which will open the doors, not just to the attainment of parity by the farmers—oh, no—but upon the terms of an endless series of demands, and ever-increasing rivalry between the classes of America, the groups in labor, and the groups in agriculture, each justly saying, "If you increased the



compensation of the other, we must have an increase likewise," thus creating an ascending cycle of inflation, bringing on the destruction of our economy, breaking down the wall and destroying our national policy, and discrediting our Government and its head, the President, and its agency, the War Labor Board.

Mr. President, I know very well that I would go beyond bounds, and that I would probably seem to be unjust if I should say that this amendment is a flank movement coming to the aid of Mr. John Lewis. I do not think that its author had that in mind, but I do not hesitate to say that that would be precisely its consequence. If we enact the amendment into law we would give Mr. John Lewis precisely the club he desires with which to make his case and bring about the consummation represented in his demands.

How quickly would he respond by saying, "All right. You did break down your line; you broke down the line which was established with respect to the farmers. Now you must break down the line for me. You did increase the cost of living; you did enact an amendment which necessarily implied an increase in the cost of living. Now be fair, and give me my demands."

How would we resist that plea? How could we justly pass the legislation which now is in conference, and which shortly will be before the Senate? How would the War Labor Board be able to hold the line? How would the President and his aides be able to maintain the stabilization so essential and so indispensable, not simply to order, but to our security, to the prosecution of the war, and to the maintenance of the economy underlying the war effort? How quickly the whole thing would fall like a house of cards, and the President and the War Labor Board and the Congress and the people be stricken down in perfect helplessness.

Mr. President, I opposed the motion to override the President's veto, made here about 6 weeks ago, as I recall. I thought I knew what I was doing at that time. I opposed it, not precisely on the technical merits of the legislation, but—as other Members of the Senate will recall—in the interest of stabilization and by way of fending against the threat of inflation.

Here it comes again—not by way of a report from the committee on the veto message or the motion to override the veto, but by way of legislation in an appropriation bill to obviate a veto message, and that at a time when all the picture of the national crisis is before us.

Six weeks ago when I spoke to the Senate, very probably some Members of the Senate did not realize, as I realized then, that we had to sustain the President, regardless of the technical merits of the matter, because not to do so would have been to paralyze his arm in the hour when he was trying to bring about stabilization. That is why I took that position then, and that is why I am speaking now. If we break down the hold-the-line order, if we contribute to the breaking down of that order, no

matter how good the cause, no matter what the merits may be—let it be said that we should like to have the farmers receive increased prices; even let it be conceded that all agricultural prices should be fixed at parity or better; and even let it be said that there is some merit in the demands of the miners, and that it might be well for them to be paid a little more here and a little more there, as Lewis demands—nevertheless, even making those concessions, which I do not make, and to which I would not agree, but even making them for the purposes and the sake of argument, in order to give emphasis to the precise motive which attends me and the necessities of the present hour, I say we can concede anything we please about the merits of the demand, and at the same time say that the hour has come in the United States of America when we must stabilize the national economy, no matter whom we disappoint, no matter what outreries we may hear.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel that the War Labor Board and the administration are about to grant John Lewis an increase of a dollar and a half a day through the portal-to-portal pay provision?

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has asked me how I feel about that. I do not feel that way. If I did, I would not trust my feelings. I am not disposed—I hope I shall not appear to be boastful—to depend upon feelings or intuitions. I could say that there are some evidences; I could say that I have some fears; but what I am saying is that I will not be a party to it; I will not contribute to it; I will not willingly have the Congress open the door to it. I will not yield; I will not make it easy for the President to yield, or for the War Labor Board to yield, or for anyone else to yield. If I had the feelings which the Senator seems to think I have, I would resist them with all the power I could summon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. After listening to the Senator's argument on the question of holding the line at the present level of things, I wonder whether he means to say that he abrogates and dismisses all the power of Congress and turns all of it over to one man.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that the Senator's question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course, I do not, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH. The reason I asked the question is that the Senate, by a vote of 78 to 2, voted for the principle involved in what was a legal question, one which had nothing to do with Mr. Lewis, except inferentially. Then, when the President vetoed the measure, we all submitted. That meant that Congress has nothing to say about it, that the President is to dictate the entire economy, whether just or unjust, and that we have nothing to say.

Mr. BAILEY. I have answered the Senator's question; but he opens up a matter to me. Mr. President, we have the power to open the doors today to all the interminable and unspeakable evils of inflation. The fact that we do not use that power does not indicate that we are supine; it does not indicate that we are giving that power to the President or to anyone else. It simply indicates that we are meeting the demands of the situation by resolving these smaller matters in favor of the larger objective of having a stabilized economy during the war.

Mr. SMITH. It occurs to me that there arose a situation which evidently a majority of the Members of Congress thought was unjust. In stabilizing this matter, the farmers or those who had their benefit payments, so-called, deducted from the parity payments thought that action was unfair. After discussion, the Senate voted 78 to 2 that it was unfair. It was a mere incident, a crook in the line that we were told to hold. The President vetoed the bill. It is now under consideration before a committee of the Senate.

Even though there may be great danger of inflation, I do not think it is likely to come from the great abundance of money which the farmers would have, and which they would spend if they are allowed to enjoy what was promised them, namely, parity.

I could go into some detail, *reductio ad absurdum*, but I cannot follow the Senator in his argument. The Senator from North Carolina is pleading with his colleagues to obey the behest of one man, against the vote of those whom the people have sent here to represent them.

The situation with respect to John L. Lewis is a thing apart. It is said that if we grant this justice to the farmer, Lewis will say, "All right; you have raised the cost of living. Now raise my wages." The Senate very nobly, and with great backbone, darted under the seats and said, "Yes, Mr. President, since you have vetoed it, we are through."

What did Mr. Lewis do? What is he doing now? Is he holding the line? Five hundred thousand miners went out on strike when the bill was to all intents and purposes killed. I think it is up to us to represent the people who sent us here.

I cannot follow the Senator in his argument. He says, "Hold the line, whether you kill people or not, but hold the line." I am perfectly willing to hold the line if it is held in justice. We may win this war against our enemies and lose America. That is the direction in which we are now headed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to my distinguished friend. That is just my contention. We can win this war and lose America; and we can lose America before we have an opportunity to win the war.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the direction in which the Senator is headed.

Mr. BAILEY. We can lose the war on the American front. I hope I am not giving aid and comfort to our enemies. News favorable to our arms comes from

all the winds that blow. Two armies of our enemies have been captured and destroyed. We have control of the air in the Mediterranean and off the coasts of Europe. We are making gains against the Japanese. Our sons, to the number of eight or nine million, true to all the best traditions of their land, have put on the armor of their country and have gone forth to battle. Industry has been converted into an arsenal. The American people have gone into their great period of trial. We can make a mistake right here which would absolutely destroy the American economy. My complaint against Mr. Lewis has been just that. He was not only defying his Government, but he was making a demand the consequences of which would open the door to demands from every quarter of labor—demands which we could not resist if we yielded to him.

In speaking today I am not speaking only to the Senate. I am speaking to the authorities down the street. I would say to the President if I were in his presence, "Mr. President, you must hold this line against John Lewis, no matter what the demands are, no matter what the threats are, no matter what the consequences are. Hold the line."

The national policy must be maintained. Once we yield we can never repair the breach. If we continue to yield, we may be as badly off as the French were about 3 years ago today when the news came that the line had been broken at Sedan on a front of 14 miles, and the German hordes were pouring through.

If we yield to Mr. Lewis' demands, we can do precisely the same thing with respect to the farmers, and we can justify the demands of John Lewis by yielding to the demands—if there be demands—from the farmers. I am taking my position against the farmer demand and against the labor demand, and for a firm and stable national policy, resolving all the minor considerations, however meritorious, in the larger objective of stabilizing the American economy, not for the sake of stability, but in order that we may maintain a country capable of sustaining the men who are fighting our battles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am listening with the greatest interest to what the Senator is saying, because he is talking about something of the greatest importance to our beloved country. But I am wondering if there is not another part of the line that is being swayed just a little. Apparently the granting of practically unlimited subsidies is in prospect. I say that with some degree of accuracy. I understand that subsidies, not granted by Congress but by one of the borrowing agencies of the Government, have been given to beef and butter to the extent of \$450,000,000, and that the plan is already in operation, or will go into operation in a day or two.

If that be true, is it not a fact that we have broken the inflationary line in another place? We must tax the American people to pay these enormous subsidies. I am told that we have already

started with subsidies for some articles, not by congressional action, but by departmental action. It seems to me that we may strike a spiral of inflation which will take us so far afield that it will be very difficult ever to get back.

The Senator has discussed two other places where the line might be broken. I should like to hear the Senator discuss the question I have raised.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not pretend to be prepared to discuss the question posed by the Senator. I have thought a great deal about it. I regret the projection of the subsidy theory into the situation; but I take it that the foundation of the proposal of subsidies is a concession with a view to maintaining the line.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. Let me undertake to answer the Senator, and state my thought. It is a price proposed to be paid in order to prevent a rise in the cost of living, and therefore to justify holding the line for wages.

Whether that is sound policy is another question. Other countries have tried it, and they seem to have had a satisfactory experience. I am not committing myself to that theory, but I would infinitely rather vote for subsidies in order to keep the cost of living down and thereby justify me in voting to hold wages and prices where they are, than not to vote for them and yield to John Lewis on the one hand and the farmers on the other, and every possible demand from every group in America.

That is the theory of the subsidy. I am not committing myself to it, but there is such a thing as throwing tubs to whales, even by government. As I understand the subsidy, it is in the nature of tubs for whales.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with practically everything the Senator has said as to the other two lines, but I was astounded a few days ago, in questioning Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, who has charge of the paying of this particular subsidy. I asked him to whom he was going to pay the subsidy. It seems that \$450,000,000 had been set aside for those two articles of food. I asked him, "To whom are you going to pay these enormous subsidies?" He told me they were going to pay the subsidies to the packers, and not to the producers. That is the kind of subsidy which, I am frank to say, alarms me very much. I feel alarmed about it in the same way that I feel alarmed about other proposed breaks in the line. I agree with the Senator that we should "hold the line."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am alarmed at these unusual prospects and proposals. We are confronted by a situation which is bound to alarm every one of us. I do not wish to make any extended remarks. I read a part of my mail, as do most Senators. I am alarmed at the revolt in America against rationing. I believe that rationing is necessary. I am alarmed at the complaints against the O. P. A. which have come to my attention. I am alarmed at the general attitude of complaint in America. I am in favor of supporting a necessary

national policy designed to meet the situation.

At the time the O. P. A. legislation was before the Senate I had a discussion with the present director of the O. P. A., former Senator Prentiss Brown. I undertook to discuss with him the practical impossibility of price fixing in a democracy. No one who has read history will deny that such an expenditure of money as we are now under the necessity of authorizing, such a limited civilian economy as is now necessary on account of the war, and such a surplus of cash in the pockets of the people which cannot be expended for goods because goods are not being produced, all predicate inflation, and therefore should alarm every thoughtful man and woman in the land.

But it is not sufficient, Mr. President, for us to be alarmed or concerned. We are the responsible body. We must translate our alarm and our concern into a positive policy, no matter what the difficulties may be. We must prevent inflation or pronounce ourselves incompetent to conduct the American Government. We must prevent inflation. By "we" I do not mean only the Congress or the President, but all of us together must prevent inflation, or else the magnificent structure which we have built up for our defense, and all the lofty sacrifices made by mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters, will be shattered and destroyed by an internal difficulty the character of which is such that no nation, since the world began, has ever been able to survive it. We cannot destroy our economy by inflation and have a country left.

Allow me to say another word. I did not mean to speak at such length. Mr. Hitler, in his *Mein Kampf*, spoke of the United States of America as "the American colossus." Do not think that the German corporal, the German leader, did not have a very respectful conception of the power of this country. It is the Colossus of the West; and he projected his course with the view of avoiding conflict with us. He hoped to keep us asleep until he had all the rest of the world under his heel. He also said that the American colossus, even with all its wealth, its might, and its people, would be no great factor in the war, even if we should get into the war. Why did he say that? He said:

The American people are a democracy. They are susceptible to all sorts of influences. Every man over there wishes to have his way. We have many groups over there to deal with.

This is his thesis, and this is the explanation of the man so far as we are concerned: He has said that American democracy will never be able to fight a total war. Theoretically he is correct. His calculations may be justified on theory. If America is to behave in that way, we shall not prevail. But America is not going to behave in that way. We will meet total effort by our enemies with total effort over here. We will either do so voluntarily, or we will do so under force of law. If we do so under force of law we shall be acting in response to necessity. Public safety is the highest law. I hope I can avoid—I hope we all can avoid—acting under



the force of necessity. I hope we all can avoid undertaking to bring about in America total effort by force.

Hear me, Senators. The only way to achieve that total effort is by a voluntary spirit in the hearts of the men and women of America. We must have leadership. We must uphold our leadership.

I like the way Senators on the other side of the aisle have conducted themselves throughout this struggle. They have not acted as partisans. I like to think that in the Committee on Commerce I have never seen a partisan vote, and never expect to see one. We cannot have any politics now. We cannot even have Democratic politics. We cannot have any personal politics. We cannot even have anti-New Deal or New Deal politics. We cannot have anti-Roosevelt or pro-Roosevelt politics. We must clench the mailed fist of 135,000,000 Americans and strike the enemy while we can. I think the time to do so is close at hand.

We are about to send abroad great numbers of our men. I have heard men say there was a shipping bottleneck. I announced last night in a little speech in Baltimore that there is not a shipping bottleneck. Everything we make can go across the sea, and every man we can equip can go across the sea, and they are going. When they go, they go in the form of their own dearly loved selves; they go with the heartaches and tears of millions of mothers; they go with the flag of their country over their heads, and, God helping me, they are going with the united strength of a national policy that does not yield and does not fear, but, on the other hand, will throw everything it has with them into this vortex of war.

So, Mr. President, I hope Senators will not think of this strike situation as a mere matter of dealing with Mr. Lewis; that they will not think of it as a matter which we can dismiss by an announcement; that they will not think of the strike situation as a mere clash as to who shall have wages and who shall not have them or whether wages are as high as they should be or otherwise; that they will not think of this proposition before the Senate today as a question of justice or injustice to the farmers, but will think of this crisis as one in which farmer and worker and Senator and mother and father and merchant and housekeeper are vitally concerned and in which they must stand as one; and that we will think of ourselves as being now under obligation to uphold the national policy, whether we like it or not.

I am receiving letters every day from people complaining about this thing and the other thing. I am trying to write them back reasonably, that the time for complaining has gone, that they should come here and state their case, and the Government will treat them as well as it can. But the Government cannot yield at any point when to yield is to open the door and invite the hordes to come in, one for wages and the other for prices, and thus destroy the money of the country, destroy its economy, and destroy our capacity to carry on the war.

So, Mr. President, I am hoping we will come through this crisis, and my faith in my country is such that I believe we will come through it. I am hoping at this moment that the Senate will not take a step now, in the very heart of the crisis, which will enable the chief conspirator of them all, Mr. Lewis, to say, "The Senate broke the line yesterday; let me go through." We are not going to do that; and, whether we like it or not, hear me as I take my seat, we have reached the hour when the national policy is established; we cannot break it down; we must sustain it. That goes for the Senate, it goes for me, it goes for the President, it goes for all the American people. I am for holding the line, whatever the cost; and I think of that line as the line that is right behind the boys who are going across the sea today; I am thinking of that line as the line that is right behind the boys who are fighting in Burma, in the South Seas, and who are soon to fight on the continent of Europe and the continent of Asia. We do not let them break the line; we do not ask them where they shall go, and we do not talk to them about justice or injustice or parity or nonparity, and we do not talk to them about wages, either.

Theirs not to reason why,  
Theirs but to do and die.

We can ask no less of ourselves.

Let it be said down in North Carolina, if you please, that I antagonized the workers. Very well; say it as much as you please; I will hold my stand. Let it be said down in North Carolina, if you please, that when the motion offered by the Senator from Alabama came before the Senate, BAILEY went back on the farmer; say it as much as you please; you will have to say, when it is all over, that BAILEY did his part to maintain the national policy and prevent inflation, and that he thought of himself as a man honored in a very great position who was not permitted to forget that the line which he held was a part of the line which is also held by 8,000,000 of our men.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope we may proceed with the other amendments to this section. The Senator from Alabama, I understand, has filed a motion to suspend the rule; that question will be debatable, and I think we can expedite the consideration of this bill if we proceed now with the committee amendments, and let the motion of the Senator from Alabama come up after their conclusion, as is usually the case.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The suggestion of the Senator in charge of the bill is entirely agreeable to me. I merely want to give notice so that every Senator will understand that at the appropriate time, probably tomorrow, I shall make a motion to suspend the rule, and ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, at the beginning of line 15 it is proposed to strike out "Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments: *Provided further,*

That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of \$500: *Provided further,* That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any shareholder or tenant of payments not exceeding that amount to which he would otherwise be entitled: *Provided further,* That the portion of said amount available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount expended under the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, for salaries and administrative expenses for carrying out programs under such acts for the period from July 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, inclusive," and insert "*Provided further,* That not to exceed \$32,500,000 of said amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the request of several Senators I am going to move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$32,500,000" and inserting "\$25,000,000."

I can state the case in a very few sentences. The Senate will recall that we are back now to the section of the bill which deals with conservation and use of agricultural land resources, and the particular pending appropriation deals with salaries and administrative costs of this particular activity.

Mr. President, the committee itself, according to the able Senator who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate found that the relative percentage for salaries and other administrative expenses in the administration of this \$400,000,000 appropriation was absolutely outrageous. As the result the committee has reduced what was an administrative expenditure last year of \$54,000,000 to \$32,500,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the relative administrative expense is still outrageous. If it was outrageous to spend \$54,000,000 in salaries and administrative expenses in handling \$450,000,000, it is still a diversion of money from the direct conservation purpose, and it is still outrageous, to spend thirty-two and a half million dollars for the administration of a net three hundred and sixty seven and a half million dollars.

I know very little personally about this matter; I merely know that that relative percentage for pay rolls and administrative expense does not make sense. I just know that if there is to be any sort of approach to personnel economy in this Government, we cannot spend thirty-two and a half million dollars to administer \$367,000,000.

When the able Senator from Georgia presented the matter, he said that in his own mind he had thought that \$25,000,000 at this point was enough, but that he did not feel like putting his own opinion against the united opinion of those who appeared before his committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator

from Michigan yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that I was of the opinion that these administrative expenses could and should be reduced to \$25,000,000 next year, but I did not intend to leave the impression that I thought they could be reduced that much this year without disorganizing the program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for making definite and clear what I was attempting to refer to. If the Senator comes as close to my \$25,000,000 figure as that, it is sufficient support for me to offer the amendment. I remind the Senate that the committee amendment is going to conference anyway. The obvious purpose of the committee itself has been to advertise the fact that the Senate is dissatisfied with the administrative expenses of these committees which administer soil conservation and kindred things. I suggest that we emphasize it to the extent of making a final reduction to \$25,000,000 when the bill goes to conference. The item will still be in conference, but the position and purpose of the Senate will be just that much more emphatic.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator is in error in his last statement, as I construe the bill. If it were true that the matter would be in conference, I should not object to the Senator's amendment. I am just as anxious to bring down administrative expenses as is any other Member of the Senate. I am perhaps more anxious than the Senator from Michigan, because while the total appropriation would not be reduced one dime, every dollar we save here is saved to go in payment to the farmers, and I represent an agricultural State, and I am just as anxious as any Member of the Senate can possibly be to reduce these administrative expenses to the fairest level that can be utilized to carry on the program. I want Senators to bear in mind, in voting on the amendment, that we would not be reducing the total appropriation 1 cent. It would be a limitation within the appropriation on the administrative expenses.

The House provision reduces the administrative expenses under this expenditure to \$27,000,000. If the Senator will read the language commencing on line 22, he will see that the House has reduced the item to one-half the amount that was expended this year, which would make it \$27,000,000. We in the committee undertook to go into the matter fully, but we did not have possession of all the facts. It was impossible to go thoroughly into the matter this year, in connection with the pending bill, if we hoped to have it enacted into law by July 1. We held hearings almost day and night in our efforts to get the bill to the floor, and Senators can observe, from the size of the report of the hearings, that we went as diligently as possible into all the items. If in conference the House conferees have any information which they can present to the conferees on the part of the Senate to the effect that the program can be carried on with \$27,000,000, without being severely ham-

pered or disorganized, I shall be glad to withdraw from the limitation of thirty-two and a half million, which was suggested by the Senate committee, but in my judgment it would be a very dangerous thing to say that we were going to cut the administrative expenses in half, and leave the conferees no opportunity whatever to consider the matter.

Even with the higher figure of thirty-two and a half million, we have brought about a most drastic reduction in the administrative expenses. If they can be carried lower than that, no one is more anxious than is the Senator from Georgia to attain that end, because every dime we save in administrative expenses goes to a farmer somewhere.

I ask Senators not to tie our hands, so that we might absolutely wreck the entire program, and even make it impossible to say that the measurements are to be made on the farms to see whether conformity is had with the provisions of the program announced by the Secretary.

I hope that when the Senator from Michigan reads the language here, which makes the limitation of the administrative expenses \$27,000,000 on the part of the House, he will not insist on the amount he suggested. I assure him of my good faith in wishing to economize to the fullest extent in the administration of the program, but no man can stand on the floor of the Senate and say what the effect of cutting this appropriation in half at this time would be. I do not know what charges have already been incurred against this appropriation. Such a limitation might bring it down to a point where it would all be consumed by the county committees, which are most numerous, as the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, and no funds would be left to carry on the program for the last 6 months of the year.

I think that in all fairness, as we have made this great stride forward in reducing the administrative expenses, we should not be tied and shackled, and perhaps bring about a condition that would disorganize the whole program.

If the Senator will read the entire section, he will see that under the House language the administrative expenses cannot exceed \$27,500,000. Under the Senate committee language they cannot exceed \$32,500,000. If it can be developed by those espousing the House position that \$27,500,000 is a sufficient amount to discharge the obligations already incurred, and to see that the program is completed, even by economizing to the marrow, below the bone, to the marrow, I assure the Senator that the conferees on the part of the Senate will cut just as low as it is possible to go.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the attitude of the able Senator from Georgia in this and all other related matters in connection with the bill. He has a very unusual efficiency in handling the entire matter. But in this instance, at least, I wish to register myself as being unwilling not to go at least as far as the House of Representatives itself has gone in this particular item. So I ask the Senator

whether I can accomplish the result to which he refers by changing my amendment so that I substitute the figure "\$27,500,000" for the figure "\$32,500,000." Would that raise the issue in the form in which I now want it raised?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would, to be candid with the Senator, but I desire to say that I am just as strongly opposed to that amendment as I am to the other suggestion of the Senator, because I think the proposal is to cut the administrative expenses in half without knowing what the effect would be. I do not think that is a proper way to legislate. The Senator from Georgia has offered amendment after amendment, year after year, to the appropriation bills as they have come along in an effort to reduce the administrative expenses. The Senator from Virginia will recall that when the original Triple A Act was pending I was disturbed about the fact that there were no restrictions on administrative expenses, and I offered an amendment on the floor at that time to assure they would not be too large. Due to the fate of that amendment in the House, and the various constructions by the Department, the desired result was not achieved; but as one who is interested in this program, I do not think we could say that the administrative expenses should be cut by one-half at this time, when we do not even know the amount that has already been obligated or expended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator accept an amendment at \$30,000,000? [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the hour grows late, and I think I shall heed the injunction to "agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him." [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that the amendment be changed to read "\$30,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 69, line 12, to strike out "or any State or county information employees: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil building practices and soil and water conservation practices under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed \$300,000,000," and in lieu thereof to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs or plans now or hereafter authorized under



section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the total expenditures of which including administration, shall not exceed \$300,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 71, after line 23, to insert:

To enable the Secretary to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco, pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, he is authorized and directed to make such commitments or incur such obligations as may be necessary in order to provide for full parity payments for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity for the crop year 1943 shall be made upon the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for such commodity under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and for the crop year 1944 on the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the 1944 agricultural conservation program: *Provided further*, That for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944 the Secretary may provide by regulations for reduction in payments for failure to comply with the acreage allotments, limits, or goals under the agricultural conservation program for 1943 or 1944, as the case may be.

For payments on the 1943 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1943 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price; and for payments on the 1944 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1944 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 74, line 9, to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$7,818,748."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, that committee amendment deals with the Federal Crop Insurance Act. The amendment proposes to raise the amount from \$3,500,000 to \$7,818,748. I wish to call the Senate's attention to the record made under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, which appears in the House hearings on this bill. Wheat insurance has been in force for 4 years. It has operated during those 4 years at a loss to the United States Government of \$17,417,000. Insurance on cotton has been in force for 1 year and during those 12 months the Government has sustained a loss of \$415,000. The total cost to the Govern-

ment of the crop-insurance plan to date is \$47,000,000. It seems to me—and this is my personal philosophy—that any business venture on the part of the Government is wrong. The Government has no business to compete with private institutions which carry on the same character of business. But granting that it is proper for the Government to engage in the business of crop insurance, it seems to me that any insurance activity which cannot justify itself by paying its way certainly should not have the continued support of the Federal Treasury.

While I am not prepared to destroy this activity entirely—although I think it should be destroyed—I move to restore the item in the section to the House figure of \$3,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course to achieve the end sought by the Senator from South Dakota the proper method would be to vote down the Senate committee amendment. A motion to restore would not be in order.

Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about this item. The Senator from South Dakota states that this crop insurance is all in competition with private industry. I challenge the Senator to point to a single insurance company in the United States of America today which would insure the type of risk that is insured by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The Senator refers to the cost of \$47,000,000. That figure applies to the administrative expenses of the organization over the 4 years it has been in operation, as well as the \$17,000,000 of losses which have been incurred. It has been the experience of private insurance companies in this country, whether they be the stock fire insurance companies or mutual fire insurance companies, that they have had approximately the same percentage of loss in the first 4 years of their operation that were incurred by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

The effect of the Senator's motion would be to repeal the act which provides for crop insurance. That is what the House had in mind when it reduced the appropriations to \$3,500,000, and inserted the proviso that no further contracts could be accepted by the Corporation.

It is true that this Corporation has suffered some losses, but it has been dealing in a new field, and did not have the experience of past operation, such as old-line companies have had, on which to rely in arriving at its rates. In the first years of operations the Corporation was selling a one-year contract. A farmer is a smart individual, and he can generally tell about what he is going to produce on his farm in any given year. If there is general precipitation in the fall, if there is good snow during the winter, and if conditions are right, the farmer knows that he is going to harvest a good crop, and he will not take out any insurance. If the conditions are unfavorable when the time comes to plant the crop the farmer would take out insurance. A remarkable map was displayed before the committee showing how increased insurance policies were taken out in areas which had poor prospects for the year,

Last year the Corporation adopted the policy of selling only a 3-year policy, requiring a farmer to pool his risk over a 3-year period with producers in other sections. I do not believe that this plan has had a fair trial. Certainly Senators who talk about legislating on appropriation bills ought to be opposed to the Senator's motion, because here the House is undertaking to repeal a statute passed by Congress by the simple expedient of denying an appropriation sufficient for the conduct of that agency.

We do not think Federal crop insurance has had a fair trial. I could fill the Record with benefits which have flowed from this organization. It so happens that the plan is in operation in the area in Missouri and Oklahoma which is being swept by a flood. I have some statistics which show the number of farmers who are insured.

Do not think that if this agency is abolished the Government is going to be relieved from expenditures of this nature, because if there were no crop insurance, Members from the flooded areas of the country would stand on the floor and request appropriations for \$20,000,000, \$30,000,000, or \$40,000,000 for relief of farmers in their flooded areas, or if insects had destroyed crops Senators would request money for relief of the farmers in the areas affected.

I predict that in the long run the crop-insurance program will prove a real economy to the Federal Treasury because of the fact that it insures the crop up to 75 percent of its value. It should be and it will be self-supporting by pooling the premiums all through an area. That will avoid the necessity for making large appropriations in Congress every time a flood occurs, or a crop failure occurs, or disaster of any kind comes to the farmer. This organization is certainly entitled to a fair trial, and the amount carried in the Senate committee amendment is only the amount asked by the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 74, line 9.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia can do so, I should like to have him point out a single insurance company which would not take the risk the insurance covers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so. We were advised in testimony given before the committee by a gentleman representing some insurance agency or other insurance organization which was supposed to write insurance on all the risks in the field that at the present time there is no company which will assume all the risks covered by the Government's contract.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In my State and, I assume, in most of the other States there are companies writing insurance to cover losses caused by hail, losses caused by wind, and losses caused by flood. What losses in addition to those are covered by the insurance the Government is writing?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Government's contract covers losses caused by drought, something which affects the Senator's State, and has affected it for years. We appropriated several million dollars

which went for the relief of farmers in the Senator's State in 1 year—an appropriation which would not have been necessary except for the occurrence of droughts. One of the largest appropriations made for such purposes in years was made in order to cover losses occurring in the Senator's State by reason of drought.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In other words, the insurance is simply a guaranty by the Federal Government that the farmer will raise a crop; is that the situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; not at all. The policy provides that the farmer must work the land in a workmanlike manner, and that the work must be approved by the county committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which must look at the farmer's land and must ascertain that he did do the work in a workmanlike manner. Even if the farmer suffers because of the ravages of drought or grasshoppers or other causes in addition to those mentioned by the Senator in his statement, he will receive a benefit of 75 percent of his loss, not 100 percent, based on the historic 5-year production cycle on the farms.

Mr. President, the crop-insurance program is new. The premiums are now being adjusted. Some have been increased and some have been decreased. Considering the full amount of insurance outstanding, the losses over the entire period do not compare with the appropriations we have made in 1 year for an area of the country which has been the victim of flood or of some other disaster.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation; but I am afraid my philosophy of government is in direct contradiction to his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 74, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment which was passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 13, after the word "newspapers", it is proposed to strike out the colon and the words "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment if the committee which had been passed over was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service", on page 77, after line 19, to insert:

#### WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r-590x, 590z-5), including the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-

carrying vehicles, \$1,278,649, of which not to exceed \$11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I undertook to explain the amendment yesterday. It does not represent an increased appropriation. It represents a transfer of funds from the appropriation suggested for the Farm Security Administration, so as to make the money available for expenditure by either the Soil Conservation Service or such other agency as might be best qualified to carry on the water-conservation program in the Far West. The amendment would restore the language of the appropriation for the present year; and under the amendment, the policy would be the same as heretofore though some funds have been transferred from the Farm Security appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 77, after line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee which had been passed over was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," on page 84, after line 24, to strike out:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-914), \$20,000,000.

Total, Rural Electrification Administration, \$22,258,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer as a substitute the legislative amendment, which I was authorized to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-914), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Virginia withhold his request for a quorum?

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator that at this time we adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the course proposed by the Senator; but the amendment now pending is the rural electrification amendment. I do not know of any Senator who objects to it. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Wilson] asked yesterday that the amendment be passed over. But today he has interposed no objection. I should like to make as much progress as possible.

Mr. McNARY. Of course. I thought the amendment might be subject to long debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any Senator who opposes it. There may be some who oppose it; I have not talked to all Members of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that I desire to have a discussion of the rural electrification amendment. I do not understand it. As I recall, it calls for an appropriation of \$30,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the smallest appropriation which has been made for the purpose for several years.

Mr. BAILEY. And the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill—a policy which, I believe, should be condemned without fail.

I hope the Senator will agree to the suggestion that the amendment be passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course I am very amenable to any suggestions by the able acting majority leader or the able minority leader, but I see no reason why we should not proceed with this matter. The Senator from North Carolina may make the point of order against it; of course, the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. I make the point of order right now, with the Senator's permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; that is perfectly all right. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I move to suspend the rule. Let me say that the only purpose of the amendment is to determine whether these appropriations shall be made directly from the Treasury or whether the work shall be financed through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be rejected, I shall move to increase the appropriation by Finance Corporation be rejected, I shall move to increase the appropriation by \$30,000,000, which is the amount of the Budget estimates for loans.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, what is to be done with the money?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is as familiar with the Rural Electrification Act as I am.



Mr. BAILEY. I am sorry for the Senator if that is the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I misunderstood.

Mr. BAILEY. I think that the Senator, as does Mr. Churchill, understates the case. However, we shall let that go.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator knows that funds have been provided in varying amounts over a period of years for the purpose of making loans to farmers' cooperatives for the establishment of electrification facilities for the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. Is any part of the fund now used for the purpose of purchasing existing electrical lines, or are all the funds used simply to extend the lines?

Mr. RUSSELL. No power is granted in the amendment that is in excess of that had under existing law.

Mr. BAILEY. But I think that probably the existing law allows the purchase of existing lines.

Mr. RUSSELL. The existing law does not allow the Rural Electrification Administration, as I understand, to purchase anything. The Rural Electrification Administration makes loans to the local cooperatives, and I understand that the local cooperatives have the power to purchase lines.

Mr. BAILEY. I like the rural electrification program. I think people living in the rural areas should have electricity. I am not objecting to that. However, I desire to know the uses to which the \$30,000,000 is to be put.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of it is to be utilized, insofar as possible, for loans to local rural electrification cooperatives.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it to be used for the purpose of buying something already in existence, or for the purpose of adding to the facilities? That is the point on which I seek information.

Mr. RUSSELL. The fund can be used for either purpose, at the option of the local cooperatives, but must be approved in any event by the R. E. A.

Mr. BAILEY. Was there any testimony before the committee or is there anything in the report to indicate that the money is to be used solely for the purpose of taking over existing lines?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it is not to be used solely for the purpose of taking over existing lines. There may be some existing lines which may be purchased. In the testimony before the committee it was developed that in some instances a rural line ran into a certain area, perhaps into a very thickly populated area right in the heart of the rural electrification cooperative, the farmers' cooperative. In that event, the farmers' cooperative purchased that line, if the owner would sell it. In some cases the owners have sold the lines. I know that in my own State, in the area of one of the strongest cooperatives we have, the Georgia Power Co. had some rural lines, and sold them to the cooperative in order that it might complete the system for the entire area in which the cooperative was operating. But there is no power of eminent domain. The cooperatives cannot take the lines away from the private owners.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that. I had information—I am not certain that it is accurate—that the whole purpose was to enable them to buy existing lines. I do not see much sense in that. If the people have lines available to them, they have them, and there is no use in buying them. The main object is to have service for the farmers. If the plan is to render service to the farmers by making available to them additional lines in new neighborhoods, I am for it; but if the proposal is one for salvaging, I am not so much interested in that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the proposition is so much one of salvaging as it is to enable the cooperatives to live. There have been areas in this country where the farmers have met and organized their cooperatives, and when the private power utilities heard that the cooperatives were organized, they would rush in and skim off the cream of the project before the cooperatives could begin to function. That has happened in a number of cases. It was discussed before the committee. In some such cases, if the cooperatives could not function and carry electricity to farmers whom the private power company did not find it profitable to serve, the cooperatives have purchased the lines. It was all a part of the plan to have an area in which a cooperative could function, so as to make it eligible for a loan from the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator has not cleared up the point in my mind, as to what it is proposed to do with the money. He talks about what the cooperatives may do, and what has been done in the past; but I do not believe the Senator is prepared to tell us whether the suggested appropriation is for the purpose of purchasing existing lines or building new lines. I should like to have some idea as to what is to be done with the \$30,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, sometimes the farmers' cooperatives are cut off by an intervening line from areas in which they could operate, and it has been necessary to buy lines to reach those areas. They could expend these funds for the purchase of such lines. However, I have no earthly way of knowing what is in the minds of the hundreds of cooperatives in this country, and of all the local boards of directors who might submit applications for loans.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the answer to the Senator's question is that the purposes of the appropriation is to extend rural lines for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the only purpose. The appropriation is not intended for the purchase of electric lines, except in particular instances when they happen to be more profitable to the cooperatives than to the private company. So far as I know—and I have followed the question rather closely—there has been no effort on the part of cooperatives to take over power companies.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, under the basic act they cannot buy any existing facilities unless such facilities are essential to the completion and purposes of a rural electrification project.

Mr. WHEELER. There have been instances in which the power companies have been glad to sell the lines because of the fact that they did not want to extend their lines farther into a particular territory. However, I do not believe that the Rural Electrification Administration has gone into any territory with the idea of buying or taking over the facilities of a power company.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I was not thinking about buying facilities of power companies. I was thinking about buying existing lines. Are we trying to serve the farmers, or to buy some lines which are already serving the farmers? The Senator from Georgia says that if we do not let the appropriation go through in accordance with the amendment, it will have to be made through an independent measure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some years ago Congress provided that instead of direct appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration, the funds should be borrowed by the Rural Electrification Administration from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and loaned to the farmers.

This amendment is legislation. It would not change the power of the R. E. A. by one jot or tittle, but would simply provide a method of financing. The House committee reported the bill in that shape to the House. Under the peculiar conditions obtaining when the bill was considered, making all these provisions subject to a point of order, the item was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Was there not some testimony before the committee to the effect that there was a dearth of copper and other materials?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That accounts for the reduction of the appropriation. It has been \$140,000,000. Now it has been reduced to \$30,000,000, because that is the amount of material which was estimated to be available by the War Production Board to carry on these projects.

Mr. SMITH. I was prompted to ask the question by the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Being unable to obtain the material, the cooperatives would like to buy other lines.

Mr. BAILEY. The lines are already in existence.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not complete my statement in answer to the Senator from North Carolina.

When the item granting authority to borrow from the R. F. C. was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order, an amendment was offered from the floor appropriating \$20,000,000 directly from the Treasury to carry out the same purposes for which sums were borrowed from the R. F. C. That amendment was adopted overwhelmingly on the

floor of the House and came to us in the bill. The only proposal is to change the method of financing from a direct appropriation to the method which had been employed for a number of years—that of borrowing from the R. F. C. and allowing the amount of the Budget estimate of \$30,000,000 for such borrowing.

Mr. BAILEY. What is the difference?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is a great deal of difference. For my part I do not care. If the Senate does not wish to have the money borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it is just as satisfactory to me to get it from the Treasury. I think, however, as this is a reimbursable item it is preferable to handle it through the R. F. C.

Mr. BAILEY. One day we get it from the Treasury and the next day we borrow it from the R. F. C. If the R. F. C. does not get it from the Treasury, I do not know where it gets it.

Let me ask the Senator one further question, and then I shall not trouble him further.

What is the idea of the Appropriations Committee, against the fixed policy of the Congress, in introducing legislation on appropriation bills? I am not allowed to do it. I am not on the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has as much right to do it as I have.

Mr. BAILEY. If I attempt to do it, the committee says that it is out of order. I am voted down, and I thank the committee for doing so. I say that it is right. But the chairman of the subcommittee brings in a number of items of legislation on an appropriation bill. I think the Senate ought to take a position on the question. If the committee can do it, why can we not do it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I cannot. Theoretically I can do it; but I have the whole committee against me, and I yield. I once tried it. I have never tried it since. I think the rule is a very good one. If it is a good rule, we ought to stick to it. I do not mean to read a lecture to my good friends, but I think the Appropriations Committee, above all, ought to adhere to that rule. We cannot afford to confuse legislation with appropriations. When we do so, we put the whole Congress in a bad position, and also make it very difficult for the President to veto legislation.

Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment go over for further consideration and debate. I should like to have a clear statement of policy, and of what it is intended to do. Why is it proposed to get the money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and what is the difference between that method and getting it from the Treasury? Why are we making a shift?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not making a shift.

Mr. BAILEY. We are violating a rule of the committee and of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee is setting an illustrious example.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not violating any rule of the Senate or of any committee. In offering amendments from the floor I am offering them under instruc-

tions from the committee, pursuant to a policy which has been adhered to for years. We are putting nothing in the bill which has not been in the act in years past. We are merely undertaking to finance these lines by the method which has been employed for the past 4 or 5 years.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator did not say that it was not legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that. I said that it was.

Mr. BAILEY. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that it was legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator think that is a good policy?

Mr. RUSSELL. The rule against legislation on an appropriation bill relates to the power of any individual Senator to make the point of order against the item on the floor. The Senator has a perfect right to make the point of order against this amendment if he chooses to do so. He still has all his rights under the rule.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not believe the Senator sees my point at all. The committee can do that sort of thing; but if an individual Senator should try it, he would be unsuccessful. We all know that to be so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the committee, in offering an amendment from the floor, does anything violative of the rules in this matter, when the Senate is told that it is legislation, every Senator is equally culpable. Under the rule any Senator has the right to make the point of order against this item.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not a violation of the rule in the sense that it undertakes to set aside the point of order; but it is a violation of the policy of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I insist that it is not a violation of any policy of the Senate. From time to time legislative provisions are offered by Members of the Senate who are not members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes; I realize they are, and even ignorantly; but I never heard of one prevailing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator to repeat what he said a few minutes ago concerning the uses to which this money is to be put. Did I understand him to say the R. E. A. already had priorities for \$30,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know that they had it down to a question of dollars and cents. The testimony before the committee was that with the 32 projects, the purchase for which of critical materials, such as copper, and so forth, had already been approved by the War Production Board, and the other projects which would be approved under the modification of the ruling of the War Production Board which affects priorities for R. E. A. cooperatives, they could spend \$30,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would then preclude the question of buying other companies?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know, Mr. President. I do not know that they are going to buy any companies. I had not heard of such a thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to the buying of lines if they have priorities.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have the right to buy lines. They should have that right.

We may as well be frank about this. When the program of rural electrification was started some of the private power companies did everything in their power to create a situation which was destined to cause its failure. There were one or two States in the Union—there was one which I have particularly in mind in which the private power interests ran lines into thickly populated areas and cut off the sparsely populated areas and therefore doomed the people in such areas to live in total darkness so far as rural electric power was concerned. I think if the R. E. A. had been able to buy that line they could have furnished power and light to the people living in the hills and along the creeks. The R. E. A. should have the right to borrow the money and buy that line. Otherwise the rural electrification program can be destroyed. In some States the power interests have cooperated. In my State of Georgia the power company cooperated with some of the companies in purchasing lines, but in other States a pretty bad record has been made in an attempt to take off the cream of the R. E. A. projects and thereby doom the cooperatives to failure from the start.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. The question I wanted answered was, Has the R. E. A. been given priorities which would substantially use up the amount asked? The Senator has answered the question in the affirmative and that ends it so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely want to make one point. My understanding is that the cooperatives have no right to acquire a private company unless the company is willing to sell.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it has been discussed here almost on the basis that the cooperatives have power to take over private lines. They do have. The point is that some of the companies are very glad to sell. Some of them are being faced with dissolution orders and are often in the position of having a line which is in the territory of an operating Rural Electrification Administration cooperative, and they are perfectly willing to sell to the cooperative because they must sell to someone. It is logical in most instances that sales should be made to the cooperative which is serving the particular rural area. As I understand, a number of such purchases have been made so that it cannot be said that this is any disadvantage to the private power companies in those instances because they have found it to be the most logical and most economic organization to sell



to, and probably they get the best price they could obtain from them.

Mr. RUSSELL. In some instances it has been of genuine benefit to the private power interests. Under the orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission divorcing holding companies in some cases, some of these companies have had isolated properties which they were ordered to sell, and if they fitted into the rural electrification program I see no reason why the rural cooperative should not be permitted to come in and buy it. They do not have the right of eminent domain. Unless they can agree on terms and conditions of private sale, there cannot be any sale of a foot of line.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to state that I shall offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and shall perhaps wish to be heard on the amendment offered by me. It seems that we shall not be able to finish this subject this afternoon.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The picture of rural electrification is replete with instances. They come tumbling one on the heels of the other. Where a rural cooperative was prepared to serve territory and upon announcing its purpose to serve a territory which had never previously been served, and which the private company had refused to serve, the private company built a spite line in to take off a certain amount of what is designated as the cream of the business, therefore making it difficult if not impossible for the rural cooperative to come into being and hope to pay its way. I have seen that occur time after time. That sort of thing has been done in my State.

The lines which have been acquired, as has been pointed out in a communication by the Administrator of the R. E. A., are frequently and generally incidental and contributory to the primary purpose of the rural electrification movement then in that community. I happen to know a great deal about those things which I have seen, and I have watched them closely, and I know exactly why objection is raised to this program. I am happy some of my Republican brethren raised it because when they make a point of order after so-called legislative additions have been made to the bill with the consent of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], it presents a peculiar picture.

Mr. BAILEY. Was the Senator referring to me?

Mr. BONE. The Senator desires to obtain information.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator said he could tell exactly why objection was raised. If he referred to me, I am going to challenge him to show anything other than what I stated. I raised the objection in order to get the information.

Mr. BONE. If the Senator from North Carolina wishes to accept the appellation of a Republican Member, I am quite content to have him do so. I am talking about what has happened.

Mr. BAILEY. I was the Senator who raised the objection.

Mr. BONE. If the Senator's ears are acute enough he heard me refer to our Republican brethren raising the objection.

Mr. BAILEY. My ears are not so long as some others, but not as acute as those of some others.

Mr. BONE. I know that that is a matter of pride with the Senator, and I shall not take issue with him. However, I wish to point out that the so-called legislative additions to this bill have been made with the consent of the able Senator from Oregon and it will present a peculiar picture if we try to crucify the R. E. A. on a point of order, and if it is made someone will discuss it, probably, but it does not look any too good for Senators to make this kind of a point of order when every Member of this body knows how some private combinations in this country feel toward rural electrification, which has been a most valuable service to the farmers. I know of areas which have never been served, and perhaps for years would not have been served, had this form of institution not come into existence. I do not want to take the time of the Senators in debating the merits of a program of this character, but I do want to protest against an attack being made upon the R. E. A.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand it is agreeable now to the Senator from Georgia that consideration of the appropriation be suspended at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I think we may as well suspend now.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further reports of committees?

#### THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs certain nominations in the Army, and ask that they be confirmed immediately. These are nominations of field officers who served in the north African campaign.

Mr. McNARY. These nominations were ordered reported to the Senate yesterday, I understand.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, it is in order to take them up today.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator very much. I ask that the nominations be confirmed immediately, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald McLaughlin to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, there appear on the Executive Calendar the nomination of Eli H. Brown 3d to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky, the nomination of John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky, and the nomination of Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky. These are all reappointments, and the officials are efficient and fine public servants. I ask that their nominations be confirmed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified immediately.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be forthwith notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GUYER, OF KANSAS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The resolutions (H. Res. 251) were read, as follows:

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 7, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the

Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the State of Kansas, has lost one of the ablest members of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives, I had known ULYSSES S. GUYER for twoscore years, from the time he was a struggling young lawyer in Kansas City, Kans. I had known him as judge of the city court, and as mayor of Kansas City, Kans.; as a civic and political leader; as a public-spirited citizen, and as an equally public-spirited official. And to know SAM GUYER was to like him and respect him. He was one of the ablest members of Congress Kansas has ever had.

Judge GUYER was a believer in our form of government and our way of life. In all the years I knew him, I never knew or heard of him doing a little thing, a mean thing, or a dishonest deed. I sincerely believe he was incapable of littleness, dishonesty, or intolerance, despite the fact that he was uncompromising with himself in his living loyalty to the beliefs he held.

I feel the world is better for his having lived and labored in it. His friends sorrow in his passing, rejoice in having known and enjoyed his comradeship while he was with us.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the June 1943 issue of Progress magazine, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. This editorial is from the pen of Dr. Clinton N. Howard, executive secretary of the International Reform Federation. Representative GUYER was for many years a trustee of this organization. Knowing him as I have, from the time he was a struggling young lawyer in Kansas City, fresh from teaching school at St. John, I think the editorial is most appropriately entitled "An Irreparable Loss."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AN IRREPARABLE LOSS

"We sorrow not as those who are without hope." Death has again invaded our official family and taken from our midst one of our long time and highly honored trustees. Congressman U. S. GUYER, of Kansas, a staunch friend of every good cause, and the father of the bill to make the city of Washington dry, is now a citizen of that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." The son of Rev. Joseph and Sarah Guyer, he took out his naturalization papers in his boyhood home, and after completing his college education became principal, then superintendent of the public schools of St. John, Kans., named for Governor St. John, the father of the prohibition amendment which remains to this day.

From that date his course was marked by distinguished service as city judge and mayor of Kansas City, Kans., where his administra-

tion was marked by a display of courage in the enforcement of the dry law in that wet city, separated by a street from Kansas City, Mo., more wicked and wet—known as "the Bottoms."

Despite political opposition and threats of personal injury, Judge GUYER, as he has since been known, cleaned up the county, the city, and padlocked the Kansas side of "the Bottoms." His record from this point is a confirmation of the divine promise: "When a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

#### A CONGRESSMAN WITHOUT GUILE

In 1902 Judge GUYER was promoted to Congress, representing the nine counties of the second district and was serving his tenth consecutive term, carrying in the late November election all the counties in his district by the largest majority in his nearly 20 years in the House, as a reward for faithful service.

The desperate wets once tried to dislodge him by nominating a voluble wet preacher on a repeal platform, but he was snowed under by an avalanche of votes. Mr. GUYER ran on his dry record in every campaign. He never hid his light under a bushel for political purposes, even threatened by wet reprisals from back home.

One of the first bills put into the hopper of the House on the reassembling of the Seventy-eighth Congress was his bill for prohibition in the District of Columbia which he leaves on the calendar of the House where he was the ranking Republican Member of the Judiciary Committee as his testimony against the liquor traffic in war or in peace.

#### A COURAGEOUS STATESMAN

He was a man of courage as was shown in many legislative battles. We have room for but one notable example. When the selective-service bill was before the House after its passage by the Senate, the editor prepared an amendment to the bill, providing for the prohibition of the sale, purchase, or possession of alcoholic liquors above one-half of 1 percent content in any military, naval, or aerial training camp, post, barracks, flying field, or canteen, on any premises owned, rented, or operated by the Federal Government, for the protection of the millions of American youth to be enlisted under the operation of the compulsory military law.

#### S. 860 CAME LATER

Months before Senator Sheppard introduced his S. 860 at the urgent request of several dry organizations both he and Congressman GUYER, at the request of the International Reform Federation sought to tie up the Selective Service Appropriation by making any portion of it available to camps in States where liquors of any alcoholic content were sold. Senator Sheppard was hesitant, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to run counter to the known policy of the administration, but promised to present it to the committee, which rejected it. Not wishing the amendment to meet the same fate in the House Military Affairs Committee when the selective-service bill reached that body, we suggested to Congressman GUYER that he propose such an amendment the moment the bill reached the floor. Without hesitation he agreed to introduce the amendment, which he did after strengthening its provisions and extending its application and supported by an eloquent appeal which met with overwhelming defeat, few of the Members of the House voting on either side.

Mr. GUYER believed that defeat was less to be dreaded than silence. It requires courage to defend the right in the face of certain defeat. "If thou faint in the day of adversity thy strength is small."

#### THE LAST ROLL CALL

Early in April he underwent a major operation at the Doctors' Hospital, and it soon became apparent that his chances for recovery faded with each passing day. "Sunset and Evening Star" was written on his countenance, when we visited the sick room at his Washington Inn home, and later the Navy hospital, from which he passed into immortality during the night of June 5. This morning, Sunday, June 6, we looked upon his strong face in sleep, and bade him a sad farewell.

Tonight a delegation from the House and Senate will accompany his body to the last resting place, St. John, Kansas, where he began his distinguished public career in the Sunflower State. Shortly after my call he dictated his last note concluding, "Thank you, dear friend, for the fruit and flowers and the beautiful prayer you made for me. God will reward you." It was his last signature, as characteristic as was the man who wrote it. We pray God to send us another GUYER from the Second Kansas District, and that the mantle of Judge GUYER may fall upon him as the mantle of Elijah fell upon Elisha. As King David said, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions, which I ask to have read and considered.

The resolutions (S. Res. 157) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] as the committee on the part of the Senate provided for in the resolution.

#### RECESS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Paul C. Campbell, Jr.  
Kenneth Grant

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations, confirmed by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:



## THE JUDICIARY

## UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Gerald McLaughlin to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Eli H. Brown 3d to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

## UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

## IN THE ARMY

## TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be lieutenant general*

Omar Nelson Bradley

*To be major generals*

Stafford LeRoy Irwin  
John Kenneth Cannon  
Lowell Warde Rooks

*To be brigadier generals*

Frank Upton Greer  
Ray Alcysious Dunn  
Maurice Rose  
Reese Maughan Howell  
Edwin Hubert Randle  
Carlyle Howe Ridenour  
Elbert Louis Ford  
Robert Victor Maraist  
Robert Ignatius Stack  
Edward Peck Curtis

## COAST GUARD

## APPOINTMENTS

*To be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from June 9, 1943*

Joseph Rogers Steele  
Ralph Arnold Peterson  
Robert Joseph LoForte  
Robert Leslie Ruth  
James Paul Van Eitten  
Norman McLeod Barlow  
Alvin Bislinghoff Jordan  
Robert Bernard Moore  
George Pershing Jacobson  
Edward Dabner Hudgens, Jr.  
Edward Michael Francis Kirchner  
Richard Anthony Pasciuti  
Glenn Edgar Murphy  
Edward DeKalb Veal, Jr.  
Ernest Harold Goldman  
Charles Webster Valaer  
LeWayne Newcomb Felts  
William Ellison Baird  
Owen Wesley Siler  
William Davis Palmer  
William Edward Dennis  
Leslie Byron George  
William Edward Wallace  
William Selby Allan, Jr.  
Keith Charles Vrana  
Mitchell Arthur Pereira  
George MacAulay Lee Costner  
John Durward Richardson  
Harry Hart Carter  
Garth Hines Read  
George William Sohm  
John Richmond Rogers  
Thomas Pope Cheatham  
David Richard Domke  
Arthur Hancock  
Charles Wayne  
Warren Edward Rast  
Kenneth Raymond Vaughn  
Wallace Clarence Dahlgren  
Samuel Raymond Woll  
Robert Allen Adams  
Robert Arthur Schulz  
Edward Reuben Tharp  
Philip Joseph McFarland  
Frederick James Hancox  
John Joseph Doherty  
Wilfred Ulrich Johnson  
James Norton Ashbrook  
Paul Morosky

Austin Flint Hubbard  
William Michael Benkert  
Keith Low  
Carl Leonard Parrott  
Robert Franklin Lutz  
Donald Oscar Ellis  
Wilfrid Neville Derby, Jr.  
Ward Raymond Emigh  
Bernard Edwin Kolkhorst  
Robert Ellsworth MacDonald  
Donald McIntosh Reed  
Daniel John Scalabrini  
Rufus Sizer Drury  
William Nathan Banks  
Robert Jerome Carson  
David Lloyd Davies, Jr.  
Frank Benjamin Carter  
Frank Marshall Fisher, Jr.  
Alden Edward Lewis  
Robert Tallant Norris  
Sereno Sewall Webster, Jr.  
Arnold Roy Wadum  
William Joseph Zinck  
Richard Eugene Hoover  
Phillip Hermann  
Curtis Johnson Kelly  
John Roger George  
Donald Arthur Caswell  
Vernon Francis Hauschild  
Alexander Cameron  
Edward Franklin Poole 3d  
Raymond Howard Evans  
Charles Edward Johnson

## POSTMASTERS

## CONNECTICUT

Peter M. Davey, Bridgeport.

## GEORGIA

W. Riley Allen, Blackshear.

## KANSAS

Hazel R. Craft, Lewis.  
Ben J. Funk, Sedan.  
J. Glenn Logan, Topeka.

## MINNESOTA

Joseph R. Dunn, Brainerd.

## NEW MEXICO

Jose Z. Sanchez, Santa Rosa.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Patrick B. Holtzclaw, Arcadia.

## WASHINGTON

David E. Burkland, Mukilteo.  
Emerson G. Lawrence, Port Angeles.  
Leo B. Reed, Redmond.  
Hanna A. Hanson, Riverton Heights.  
John Maloney, Jr., Skykomish.  
Otto F. Reinig, Snoqualmie.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, our heavenly Father, what wisdom, what power and majesty in all Thy works. Out of the mysterious silences of our breasts, amid the varying currents of this world, do we seek Thee. Thou who art the inspiration of all that is good and the glory of all that is beautiful, send forth Thy light, reminding us of our place and calling. Do Thou open the windows of our minds that we may receive the spirit of love and truth, thus leading humanity away from the wrong, deceptive altars.

Blessed Lord, as daily there are numberless Calvaries in our land, we pray Thee that all sadly stricken hearts may

hear the message which has come across the centuries: "Be of good cheer, I will go with thee all the way." Undergird and uphold them with firm belief in the ultimate triumph of the good. Under all circumstances inspire us to think truly, to speak truly, and to live truly; thus our lives will be open books of good and wholesome deeds. In the name of our Saviour, by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honor and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of May 30, 1943, entitled "City of Revere."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under a special order for today I was granted 30 minutes to address the House. I yield back that time, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter on the Liberty Bell and a poem, The Bishop of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.